Wiretap Channels with Random States Non-Causally Available at the Encoder

Ziv Goldfeld, Paul Cuff and Haim H. Permuter

arXiv:1608.00743v1 [cs.IT] 2 Aug 2016

Abstract

We study the state-dependent (SD) wiretap channel (WTC) with non-causal channel state information (CSI) at the encoder. This model subsumes all other instances of CSI availability as special cases, and calls for an efficient utilization of the state sequence both for reliability and security purposes. A lower bound on the secrecy-capacity, that improves upon the previously best known result by Chen and Han Vinck, is derived based on a novel superposition coding scheme. An example in which the proposed scheme achieves strictly higher rates is provided. Specializing the lower bound to the case where CSI is also available to the decoder reveals that the lower bound is at least as good as the achievable formula by Chia and El-Gamal, which is already known to outperform the adaptation of the Chen and Han Vinck code to the encoder and decoder CSI scenario. Our achievability gives rise to the exact secrecy-capacity characterization of a class of SD-WTCs that decompose into a product of two WTCs, one is independent of the state and the other one depends only on it. The results are derived under the strict semantic-security metric that requires negligible information leakage for all message distributions. The proof of achievability relies on a stronger version of the soft-covering lemma for superposition codes.

Index Terms

Channel state information, Gelfand-Pinsker channel, semantic-security, soft-covering lemma, state-dependent channel, superposition code, wiretap channel.

I. Introduction

Reliably transmitting a message over a noisy state-dependent (SD) channel with non-causal encoder channel state information (CSI) is of the most fundamental problem settings in information theory. The formulation of the problem and the derivation of its capacity dates back to Gelfand and Pinsker's (GP's) celebrated paper [1]. While the original motivation for the problem, as presented in [1], stems from the memory with stuck-at faults example [2], the implications of the result were much broader. One such prominent implication is that viewing the state

The work of Z. Goldfeld and H. H. Permuter was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 2012/14), the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n°337752, and the Cyber Center and at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. The work of P. Cuff was supported by the National Science Foundation (grant CCF-1350595) and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (grant FA9550-15-1-0180).
This paper will be presented in part at the 2016 IEEE International Conference on the Science of Electrical Engineers (ICSEE-2016), Eilat, Israel.
Z. Goldfeld and H. H. Permuter are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel (gziv@post.bgu.ac.il, haimp@bgu.ac.il). Paul Cuff is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA (e-mail: cuff@princeton.edu).

sequence (known to the encoder) as a codeword of some other message naturally relates the GP scenario to the problem of broadcasting. It is therefore of no surprise that GP coding achieves the corner points of the best known inner bound on the capacity region of the broadcast channel [3]. Another virtue of the GP model is its generality. Namely, it is the most general instance of a SD point-to-point channel in which any or all of the terminals have non-causal access to sequence of states. Motivated by the above as well as the indisputable importance of security in modern communication systems, we study the SD wiretap channel (WTC) with non-causal encoder CSI, which incorporates the notion of security in the presence of a wiretapper into the GP channel coding problem.

Secret communication over noisy channels was pioneered by Wyner who introduced the degraded WTC and derived its secrecy-capacity [4]. Csiszár and Körner later extended Wyner's result to the non-degraded WTC [5]. These two results formed the basis for the study of what is now referred to as physical-layer security and sprung a variety of works on related topic, among which are SD-WTCs. The interest in WTCs with random states relates to the observation that knowledge of state sequence may be exploited as an additional source of randomness to boost up secrecy performance. Consequently, the key question in this context is how to best exploit the state for secrecy purposes, while taking into account coding techniques designed for transmission over SD channels.

First to consider a discrete and memoryless (DM) WTC with random states were Chen and Han Vinck [6], that studied encoder CSI scenario. They established a lower bound on the secrecy-capacity based on a combination of wiretap coding with GP coding. This work was later generalized in [7] to a WTC that is driven by a pair of states, one available to the encoder and the other one to the decoder. However, as previously mentioned, since CSI at the encoder is the most general setup, the result of [7] is a special of [6]. A more sophisticated coding scheme was constructed by Chia and El-Gamal for the SD-WTC with causal encoder CSI and full decoder CSI [8]. Their idea was to explicitly extract a cryptographic key from the random state, and protect a part of the confidential message via a one-time-pad with that key. The remaining portion of the confidential message is protected using a wiretap code (whenever wiretap coding is possible). Although their code is restricted to utilize the state in a causal manner, the authors of [8] proved that it can strictly outperform the adaptations of the non-causal schemes from [6], [7] to the encoder and decoder CSI setup. Other related directions of research include key-agreement over SD-WTCs by means of non-causal encoder CSI [9], and action-dependent SD-WTCs [10], where the encoder can affect the formation of the channel states by means of an action sequence (see also references therein).

In this paper we study the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI, for which we propose a novel superposition-based coding scheme. The scheme results in a new lower bound on the secrecy-capacity, which recovers the previously best known achievability formulas from [6] and [7] as special cases. We show that the relation to the previous schemes can be strict, i.e., an example is fashioned where our scheme achieves strictly higher secrecy rates than [6], [7]. The example is a specific instance of a class of SD-WTC whose channel transition probability decomposes into a WTC that is independent of the state and another channel that generates two noisy versions of the state, each observed either by the legitimate receiver or by the eavesdropper. We show that when the WTC's output to the eavesdropper is less noisy than the one observed by the legitimate user, our lower bound is tight - thus characterizing the secrecy-capacity.

When specializing to the case where the decoder also knows the state sequence, our achievability is shown to be at least as good as the scheme from [8]. In fact, [8] provided two separate coding schemes and stated their achievability result as the maximum between the two. Recovering [8] from our lower bound results in a compact and simplified (yet equivalent) characterization of their achievable formula. Thus, our superposition-based coding scheme encompasses a unification of the two schemes from [8]. Interestingly, while both schemes from [8] rely on generating the aforementioned cryptographic key, our code construction does not involve any explicit key generation/agreement phase. Instead, we use an over-populated superposition codebook and encode the entire confidential message at the outer layer. The transmission is correlated with the state sequence by means of the likelihood encoder [11], while security is ensured by making the eavesdropper decode the inner layer codeword that contains no confidential information. Having done so, the eavesdropper is lacking the resources to extract any information about the secret message. A superposition-based code construction for secrecy purposes was considered before in the context of lossy source coding in [12], where too the eavesdropper was compelled to decode a layer that contains no useful information.

Our results are derived under the strict metric of semantic-security (SS). The SS criterion is a cryptographic benchmark that was adapted to the information-theoretic framework (of computationally unbounded adversaries) in [13]. In that work, SS was shown to be equivalent to a negligible mutual information between the message and the eavesdropper's observations for all message distributions. In contrast to our stringent security requirement, all the aforementioned secrecy results were derived under the weak-secrecy metric, i.e., a vanishing *normalized* mutual information with respect to a *uniformly distributed* message. Nowadays, however, weak-secrecy is widely regarded as being too loose, giving rise to the recent effort of upgrading information-theoretic secrecy results to the strong-secrecy metric (namely, by removing the normalization factor but keeping the uniformity assumption on the message). SS is clearly a further strengthening of them both. Consequently, our achievability result outperforms the schemes from [6], [7] for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI not only in terms of the achievable secrecy rate, but also in the upgraded sense of security it provides. When CSI is also available at the decoder, our result implies that an upgrade to SS is possible, without inflicting any loss of rate compared to [8].

While derivations of weak-secrecy largely rely on the groundwork laid by the early works Wyner [4] and Csiszár and Körner [5], ensuring SS calls for stronger tools. In the spirit of our previous papers [14] and [15], the SS analysis relies on a stronger version of the soft-covering lemma (SCL) for superposition codebooks given in [16, Corollary VII.8]. Namely, we show that a random superposition codebook achieves the soft-covering phenomenon with high probability. The probability of failure is doubly-exponentially small in the blocklength. The union bound combined with some additional distribution approximation arguments is then used to establish SS. Our code is also designed to produce an arbitrarily small *maximal* error probability via the expurgation method (e.g., cf. [17, Theorem 7.7.1]).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II provides notation and basic definitions and properties. In Section III, we define the setup of soft-covering for superposition codebooks and state the strong SCL. Section IV describes the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI and gives the lower bound on its SS-capacity.

In Section V we discuss the results and compare them to previous works. The same section also states some tight SS-capacity results and contains the example that shows the superiority of our scheme compared to [6], [7]. Proofs are provided in Section VI, while Section VII summarizes the main achievements and insights of this work.

II. Notations and Preliminaries

We use the following notations. As customary $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers (which does not include 0), while $\mathbb{R}$ denotes the reals. We further define $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x > 0\}$. Given two real numbers a, b, we denote by $[a:b]$ the set of integers $\big\{n \in \mathbb{N} \big| \lceil a \rceil \leq n \leq \lfloor b \rfloor\big\}$. Calligraphic letters denote sets, e.g., $\mathcal{X}$, the complement of $\mathcal{X}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{X}^c$, while $|\mathcal{X}|$ stands for its cardinality. $\mathcal{X}^n$ denoted the n-fold Cartesian product of $\mathcal{X}$. An element of $\mathcal{X}^n$ is denoted by $x^n = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$; whenever the dimension n is clear from the context, vectors (or sequences) are denoted by boldface letters, e.g., $\mathbf{x}$. A substring of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is denoted by $x_i^j = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_j)$, for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$; when $i = 1$, the subscript is omitted. We also define $x^{n \setminus i} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$. Random variables are denoted by uppercase letters, e.g., X, with similar conventions for random vectors.

Let $\big(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\big)$ be a probability space, where $\mathcal{X}$ is the sample space, $\mathcal{F}$ is the σ-algebra and $\mathbb{P}$ is the probability measure. Random variables over $\big(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\big)$ are denoted by uppercase letters, e.g., X, with conventions for random vectors similar to those for deterministic sequences. The probability of an event $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$, while $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}\big|\mathcal{B})$ denotes conditional probability of $\mathcal{A}$ given $\mathcal{B}_n$. We use $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to denote the indicator function of $\mathcal{A}$. The set of all probability mass functions (PMFs) on a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) = \left\{ P : \mathcal{X} \to [0,1] \middle| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) = 1] \right\}. \tag{1}$$

PMFs are denoted by the uppercase letters such as P or Q, with a subscript that identifies the random variable and its possible conditioning. For example, for a discrete probability space $\big(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\big)$ and two correlated random variables X and Y over that space, we use P_X, $P_{X,Y}$ and $P_{X|Y}$ to denote, respectively, the marginal PMF of X, the joint PMF of (X, Y) and the conditional PMF of X given Y. In particular, $P_{X|Y}$ represents the stochastic matrix whose elements are given by $P_{X|Y}(x|y) = \mathbb{P}\big(X = x | Y = y\big)$. Expressions such as $P_{X,Y} = P_X P_{Y|X}$ are to be understood as $P_{X,Y}(x,y) = P_X(x) P_{Y|X}(y|x)$, for all $(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Accordingly, when three random variables X, Y and Z satisfy $P_{X|Y,Z} = P_{X|Y}$, they form a Markov chain, which we denote by $X - Y - Z$. We omit subscripts if the arguments of a PMF are lowercase versions of the random variables. The support of a PMF P and the expectation of a random variable X are denoted by $\mathrm{supp}(P)$ and $\mathbb{E}\big[X\big]$, respectively.

For a discrete measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, a PMF $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ gives rise to a probability measure on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, which we denote by $\mathbb{P}_Q$; accordingly, $\mathbb{P}_Q\big(\mathcal{A}\big) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}} Q(x)$, for every $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}$. We use $\mathbb{E}_Q$ to denote an expectation taken with respect to $\mathbb{P}_Q$. For a random variable X, we sometimes write $\mathbb{E}_X$ to emphasize that the expectation is taken with respect to P_X. For a sequence of random variable X^n, if the entries of X^n are drawn in an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) manner according to P_X, then for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ we have $P_{X^n}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_X(x_i)$ and we write $P_{X^n}(\mathbf{x}) = P_X^n(\mathbf{x})$. Similarly, if for every $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ we have $P_{Y^n|X^n}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{Y|X}(y_i|x_i)$,

then we write $P_{Y^n|X^n}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = P^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$. We often use Q^n_X or $Q^n_{Y|X}$ when referring to an i.i.d. sequence of random variables. The conditional product PMF $Q^n_{Y|X}$ given a specific sequence $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is denoted by $Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}$.

The empirical PMF $\nu_{\mathbf{x}}$ of a sequence $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is

$$\nu_{\mathbf{x}}(x) \triangleq \frac{N(x|\mathbf{x})}{n}, \tag{2}$$

where $N(x|\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{x_i=x\}}$. We use $\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(P_X)$ to denote the set of letter-typical sequences of length n with respect to the PMF P_X and the non-negative number ϵ [18, Chapter 3], i.e., we have

$$\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(P_X) = \Big\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n \Big| \ \big|\nu_{\mathbf{x}}(x) - P_X(x)\big| \le \epsilon P_X(x), \ \forall x \in \mathcal{X}\Big\}. \tag{3}$$

Definition 1 (Relative Entropy) *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ be a measurable space and let P and Q be two probability measures on $\mathcal{F}$, with $P \ll Q$ (i.e., P is absolutely continuous with respect to Q). The relative entropy between P and Q is*

$$D(P||Q) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} dP \log\left(\frac{dP}{dQ}\right), \tag{4}$$

where $\frac{dP}{dQ}$ denotes the Radon-Nikodym derivative between P and Q. If the sample space $\mathcal{X}$ is countable, (4) *reduces to*

$$D(P||Q) = \sum_{x \in \mathrm{supp}(P)} P(x) \log\left(\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}\right). \tag{5}$$

Definition 2 (Total Variation) *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ be a measurable and P and Q be two probability measures on $\mathcal{F}$. The total variation between P and Q is*

$$||P - Q||_{\mathrm{TV}} = \sup_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}} \big|P(\mathcal{A}) - Q(\mathcal{A})\big|. \tag{6}$$

If the sample space $\mathcal{X}$ is countable, (6) *reduces to*

$$||P - Q||_{\mathrm{TV}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \big|P(x) - Q(x)\big|. \tag{7}$$

III. Strong Soft-Covering Lemma for Superposition Codes

Our derivation of SS for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI relies on a new strong SCL (in the spirit of [14], [15]) adjusted for superposition codebooks. The setup is illustrated in Fig. 1, where inner and outer layer codewords are uniformly chosen from the corresponding codebook and passed through a DMC to produce and output sequence. The induced distribution of the output should serve as a good approximation of a product distribution. The approximation is in terms of relative entropy, which is shown to converge to 0 exponentially quickly with high probability. The negligible probability is doubly-exponentially small with the blocklength n.

Fix $Q_{U,V,W} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{W})$ and let I and J be two independent random variables uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{I}_n \triangleq \big[1 : 2^{nR_1}\big]$ and $\mathcal{J}_n \triangleq \big[1 : 2^{nR_2}\big]$, respectively. Furthermore, let $\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_U \triangleq \big\{\mathbf{U}(i)\big\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n}$ be a random inner layer codebook which is a set of random vectors of length n that are i.i.d. according to Q^n_U. A realization of $\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_U$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_U \triangleq \big\{\mathbf{u}(i, \mathcal{B}_U)\big\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n}$.




Fig. 1. Superposition soft-covering setup with the goal of making $P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} \approx Q_W^n$, where $\mathcal{B}_n = \left\{\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\right\}$ is a fixed superposition codebook.

To describe the outer layer codebook, fix $\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}$ and for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ let $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i) \triangleq \left\{\mathbf{V}(i,j)\right\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n}$ be a collection of i.i.d. random vectors of length n with distribution $Q_{V|U=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)}^n$. A random outer layer codebook (with respect to an inner codebook $\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}$) is defined as $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)} \triangleq \left\{\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i)\right\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$. A realization of $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i)$, for $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}(i) \triangleq \left\{\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)\right\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n}$, respectively. We also use $\mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}$ to denote a realization of $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}$. Thus, a random superposition codebook is given by $\mathbb{B}_n = \left\{\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}\right\}$, while $\mathcal{B}_n = \left\{\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\right\}$ denotes a fixed codebook. Under this construction, the joint probability of drawing a superposition codebook $\mathcal{B}_n = \left\{\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\right\}$ is

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathbb{B}_V^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\Big) = \underbrace{\prod_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} Q_U^n\big(\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\big)}_{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)}=\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}\right)} \underbrace{\prod_{i'\in\mathcal{I}_n}\left(\prod_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} Q_{V|U}^n\big(\mathbf{v}(i',j,\mathcal{B}_V)\big|\mathbf{u}(i',\mathcal{B}_U)\big)\right)}_{\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}=\mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\middle|\mathbb{B}_U=\mathcal{B}_U\right)}. \tag{8}$$

For a fixed superposition code $\mathcal{B}_n$, the output sequence $\mathbf{W}$ is generated by independently drawing I and J from $\mathcal{I}_n$ and $\mathcal{J}_n$, respectively, and feeding $\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)$ and $\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)$ into the DMC $Q_{W|U,V}^n$. We denote the induced PMF on $\mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{U}^n \times \mathcal{J}_n \times \mathcal{V}^n \times \mathcal{W}^n$ by $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, which is given by [1]

$$P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,\mathbf{u},j,\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}) = 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\right\}\cap\left\{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)\right\}} Q_{W|U,V}^n(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}). \tag{9}$$

Accordingly, the induced output distribution is

$$P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} Q_{W|U,V}^n\big(\mathbf{w}\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}\big(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V\big)\big) \tag{10}$$

The strong SCL for superposition codes is stated next.

Lemma 1 (Strong Superposition Soft-Covering Lemma) *For any Q_U, $Q_{V|U}$, $Q_{W|U,V}$, where $|\mathcal{W}| < \infty$, and $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ with*

$$R_1 > I(U;W) \tag{11a}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 > I(U,V;W), \tag{11b}$$

[1]To simplify notation, from here on out we assume that quantities of the form 2^{nR}, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$, are integers. Otherwise, simple modifications of some of the subsequent expressions using floor operations are required.

there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$, such that for n large enough

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}\Big\|Q_W^n\Big) > e^{-n\gamma_1}\bigg) \leq e^{-e^{n\gamma_2}}. \tag{12}$$

More precisely, for any $\delta_1 \in \big(0, R_1 - I(U;W)\big)$ and $\delta_2 \in \big(0, R_1 + R_2 - I(U,V;W)\big)$ with $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < 2\delta_1$ and n sufficiently large

$$\mathbb{P}\bigg(D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}\Big\|Q_W^n\Big) \geq c_{\delta_1,\delta_2} n 2^{-n\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}}\bigg) \leq 2^{nR_2}\cdot e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\delta_1}} + |\mathcal{W}|^n\left[2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\frac{\delta_2}{2}}} + e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\frac{\delta_2-\delta_1}{2}}}\right], \tag{13}$$

where

$$\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2} = \sup_{\alpha>1}\min\left\{\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}, \beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}, \frac{\delta_1}{4}\right\}, \tag{14a}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1} = \frac{\alpha-1}{2\alpha-1}\big(R_1 - \delta_1 - d_\alpha(Q_{U,W}, Q_U Q_W)\big), \tag{14b}$$

$$\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2} = \frac{\alpha-1}{2\alpha-1}\big(R_1 + R_2 - \delta_2 - d_\alpha(Q_{U,V,W}, Q_{U,V} Q_W)\big), \tag{14c}$$

$$c_{\delta_1,\delta_2} = 4\bigg(\log e + 2\sup_{\alpha>1}\min\Big\{\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}, \beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\Big\}\log 2\bigg) + \log e + 2\log\left(\max_{w\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_W)}\frac{1}{Q_W(w)}\right), \tag{14d}$$

and $d_\alpha(\mu,\nu) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log_2\int d\mu\left(\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha}$ is the Rényi divergence of order α.

The proof of the lemma is relegated to Section VI-A. The important quantity in the lemma above is $\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}$, which is the exponent that the soft-covering achieves. We see in (13) that the double-exponential convergence of probability occurs for any $(\delta_1,\delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ with $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < 2\delta_1$. Thus, the best soft-covering exponent that the lemma achieves with confidence, over all such δ_1 and δ_2 values is

$$\gamma^* = \sup_{\substack{(\delta_1,\delta_2)\in\mathbb{R}_{++}^2:\\ \delta_1<\delta_2<2\delta_1}} \gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}. \tag{15}$$

However, due to the structure of $\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}$ the value of γ^* cannot be expressed in closed form. This is since while $\delta_1 \to 0$ achieves $\sup_{\delta_1\in\mathbb{R}_{++}}\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}$, it clearly results in the right-hand side (RHS) of (14a) being zero.

Remark 1 *The double-exponential confidence rates δ_1 and δ_2 act as a reduction in codebook rate R_1 and the sum of rates $R_1 + R_2$, respectively, in the definition of γ_δ. Consequently, $\gamma_{\delta_1} = 0$ if either $\delta_1 \geq R_1 - I(U;W)$ or $\delta_2 \geq R_1 + R_2 - I(U,V;W)$. Thus, the inequality* (13) *is trivially true if either δ_1 or δ_2 are outside of their specified ranges. The ordering $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < 2\delta_1$ is related to ensuring that each of double-exponential confidence rates from the RHS of* (13) *are positive.*

IV. Wiretap Channels with Random States Non-Causally Available at the Encoder

We study the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI, for which we establish a new and improved achievability formula that (in some cases) strictly outperforms the previously best known coding schemes for this scenario. The secrecy-capacity of a WTC with random states observed non-causally by some or all of the terminals is a highly




Fig. 2. The state-dependent wiretap channel with non-casual encoder channel state information.

challenging problem in information-theoretic security that have received noticeable attention throughout the years (see, e.g., [6]–[8], [19]). This interest in such secure communication scenarios stems from trying to understand how to optimally correlate the transmission with the state observation while exploiting the additional randomness offered by the knowledge of the state sequence to further enhance the secrecy rate. The optimal integration of these two ingredient is yet to be fully understood.

A. Problem Setup

Let $\mathcal{S},\ \mathcal{X},\ \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ be finite sets. The $\left(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z},W_S,W_{Y,Z|X,S}\right)$ DMSD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI is illustrated in Fig. 2. A state sequence $\mathbf{s}\in\mathcal{S}^n$ is generated in and i.i.d. manner according to W_S and is revealed in a non-causal fashion to the sender, who chooses a message m from the set $\left[1:2^{nR}\right]$. The sender then maps the observed state sequence $\mathbf{s}$ and the chosen message m into a sequence $\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{X}^n$ (the mapping may be random). The sequence $\mathbf{x}$ is transmitted over the DMSD-WTC with transition probability $W_{Y,Z|X,W}$. The output sequences $\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{Y}^n$ and $\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{Z}^n$ are observed by the receiver and the eavesdropper, respectively. Based on $\mathbf{y}$, the receiver produces an estimate $\hat{m}$ of m. The eavesdropper tries to glean whatever it can about the message from $\mathbf{z}$.

Remark 2 (Most General Model) *Before rigorously defining the setup and stating the result, we note that the considered model is the most general instance of a SD-WTC with non-causal CSI known at some or all of the terminals. The broadest model one may consider is when the SD-WTC $W_{\tilde{Y},\tilde{Z}|X,S_1,S_2,S_3}$ is driven by a triple of correlated state random variables $(S_1,S_2,S_3)\sim W_{S_1,S_2,S_3}$, where S_1 is known to the transmitter, S_2 is known to the receiver and S_3 is available at the eavesdropper's site. However, setting $S=S_1$, $Y=(\tilde{Y},S_2)$, $Z=(\tilde{Z},S_3)$ in SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI and defining the channel's transition probability as*

$$W_{Y,Z|X,S}=W_{(\tilde{Y},S_2),(\tilde{Z},S_3)|X,S_1}=W_{S_2,S_3|S_1}W_{\tilde{Y},\tilde{Z}|X,S_1,S_2,S_3}, \tag{16}$$

one clearly recovers this (prima facie) general SD-WTC from the model with non-causal encoder CSI only.

Definition 3 (Code) *An (n,R)-code c_n for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI has a message set $\mathcal{M}_n\triangleq\left[1:2^{nR}\right]$, a stochastic encoder $f_n:\mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{S}^n\to\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ and a decoder $\phi_n:\mathcal{Y}^n\to\hat{\mathcal{M}}_n$, where $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_n=\mathcal{M}_n\cup\{e\}$ and $e\notin\mathcal{M}_n$.*

For any message distribution $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ and any (n, R)-code c_n, the induced joint PMF on $\mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{M}_n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \hat{\mathcal{M}}_n$ is:

$$P^{(c_n)}(\mathbf{s}, m, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \hat{m}) = W_S^n(\mathbf{s}) P_M(m) f_n(\mathbf{x}|m, \mathbf{s}) W_{Y,Z|X,S}^n(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}) \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\hat{m}=\phi_n(\mathbf{y})\right\}}. \tag{17}$$

The performance of c_n is evaluated in terms of its rate R, the maximal decoding error probability and the SS-metric.

Definition 4 (Maximal Error Probability) *The maximal error probability of an (n, R)-code c_n is*

$$e(c_n) = \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} e_m(c_n), \tag{18a}$$

where

$$e_m(c_n) = \sum_{(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n} W_S^n(\mathbf{s}) f_n(\mathbf{x}|m, \mathbf{s}) \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n: \\ \phi_n(\mathbf{y}) \neq m}} W_{Y,Z|X,S}^n(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s}). \tag{18b}$$

Definition 5 (Information Leakage and SS Metric) *Let c_n be an (n, R)-code for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI and $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$. The information leakage to the eavesdropper under the message distribution $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ is*

$$\ell(P_M, c_n) = I_{c_n}(M; \mathbf{Z}), \tag{19}$$

where the subscript c_n denotes that the mutual information term is calculated with respect to the joint PMF of M and $\mathbf{Z}$ induced by c_n, i.e., with respect to the marginal $P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(c_n)}$ of (17)*. The SS metric with respect to c_n is* [2]

$$\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n) = \max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} \ell(P_M, c_n). \tag{20}$$

Remark 3 *SS requires that the code c_n works well for all message PMFs. This means that the mutual information term in* (20) *is maximized over P_M when the code c_n is known. In other words, although not stated explicitly, P_M may depend on c_n.*

Definition 6 (Achievability) *A number $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is called an achievable SS-rate for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI, if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n, there exists a CR (n, R)-code c_n with*

$$e(c_n) \leq \epsilon \tag{21a}$$

$$\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n) \leq \epsilon. \tag{21b}$$

Remark 4 *Our achievability proof shows that $\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n)$ vanishes exponentially fast. This is a standard requirement in the cryptography community, commonly referred to as strong-SS (see, e.g., [13, Section 3.2]).*

[2] $\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n)$ is actually the mutual-information-security (MIS) metric, which is equivalent to SS by [13]. We use the representation in (20) rather than the formal definition of SS (see, e.g., [13, Equation (4)]) out of analytical convenience.

Definition 7 (SS-Capacity) *The SS-capacity C_{Sem} of the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI is the supremum of the set of achievable SS-rates.*

B. Main Result

The main result of this work is a novel lower bound on the SS-capacity of the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI. Our achievability formula is subsequently shown to strictly outperform the best previously known coding scheme for the considered scenario. It is also shown to be tight for certain instances of the SD-WTC of interest. To state our main result, let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be finite alphabets and for any $Q_{U,V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$ define

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right) \triangleq \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U), \\ I(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;S), \\ I(U,V;Y) - I(U;S) - I(V;Z|U) \end{array} \right\}, \tag{22}$$

where the mutual information terms are calculated with respect to the joint distribution $W_S Q_{U,V,X|S} W_{Y,Z|X,S}$.

Theorem 1 (SD-WTC SS-Capacity Lower Bound) *The SS-capacity of the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI is lower bounded as*

$$C_{\mathrm{Sem}} \geq R_{\mathrm{A}} \triangleq \max_{Q_{U,V,X|S}} R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right), \tag{23}$$

and one may restrict the cardinalities of U and V to $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}| + 5$ and $|\mathcal{V}| \leq |\mathcal{S}|^2|\mathcal{X}|^2 + 5|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}| + 3$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section VI-B and is based on a novel superposition coding scheme for secrecy. The superposition codebook encodes the entire secret message in its *outer layer*, meaning that no information is carried by the inner layer of the code. Nonetheless, the rate of the inner layer codebook is chosen to allow the eavesdropper to decode it. This results in the eavesdropper 'wasting' his channel resources on decoding the inner layer, leaving it with insufficient resources to unveil any information on the secret message. The legitimate decoder, on the other hand, decodes both layers of the codebook. The transmission is correlated with the observed state sequence by means of the likelihood encoder [11] and SS is established using the strong SCL (both the superposition version from Lemma 1 and the heterogeneous SCL from [15, Lemma 1]).

Remark 5 (Relation to Past Results) *Our achievability result recovers the previously best known scheme for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI from [6], [7] as a special case. Furthermore, in Section V-C, an example where R_{A} is strictly larger than the secrecy-rates achievable in [6], [7] is provided (the sub-optimality of [6], [7] was already shown in [8], but our example falls outside the framework of [8]). If the state sequence $\mathbf{S}$ is also known at the legitimate receiver (obtained by replacing Y with (Y,S) in the considered SD-WTC), our result is at least as good as the best known lower bound by Chia and El-Gamal from [8, Theorem 1]. The latter work considered the case where the encoder learns the channel's state in a causal manner. Nonetheless, the authors of [8] show that using their causal scheme even when the CSI is available non-causally to the encoder can strictly outperform*

the schemes from [6], [7] when $Y = (Y, S)$. As seen in Section V-A, replacing Y with (Y, S) in R_A from (23)*, the auxiliary random variables U and V can be chosen to recover the rate bounds from [8, Theorem 1]. In addition, since our scheme is tailored for the non-causal CSI scenario, our joint distribution allows correlation between the auxiliary random variable and the state, while in [8, Theorem 1] they are uncorrelated.*

Remark 6 (Tightness for Some Special Cases) *Theorem 1 also produces some new secrecy-capacity results. In particular, in Section V-B we show that R_{A} achieves optimality when the legitimate receiver and the eavesdropper observe $\tilde{Y} = (Y, S_1)$ and $\tilde{Z} = (Z, S_2)$, respectively, drawn according to $W_{S_1,S_2,Y,Z|X,S} = W_{S_1,S_2|S} W_{Y,Z|X}$, and $W_{Y,Z|X}$ is such that the eavesdropper's channel is less noisy than the main channel. Namely, the wiretap channel is independent of the state and favors the eavesdropper over the legitimate receiver; in addition, noisy observations of the state sequences are available to the receiver and to the eavesdropper. The example mentioned in Remark 5 that establishes the sub-optimality of [6], [7] is an instance of such a SD-WTC $W_{S_1,S_2,Y,Z|X,S}$. In turn, this means that the secrecy-capacity of this class of channel cannot be recovered from the inner bounds of [6], [7]. Furthermore, an explicit coding scheme based on a key-agreement protocol that achieves optimality for this scenario is provided and its relation to the general scheme that achieves R_{A} is explained.*

Another scenario where R_{A} is tight is when the SD-WTC is also semi-deterministic in the sense that $Y = f(S, X)$, for some function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$. Although the coding schemes from [6], [7] are sufficient to achieve secrecy-capacity for this case, to the best of our knowledge, this result was not derived before.

Remark 7 (Relations Between the Mutual Information Terms in the Lower Bound) *The information measures in the definition of $R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ from* (22) *are related to one another in the following manner. Replacing $I(V; Z|U)$ with $I(V; S|U)$ in the third term inside the minimum produces the second term, while subtracting $I(U; Y) - I(U; S)$ from the third term results in the first.*

Remark 8 (Cardinality Bounds) *The cardinality bounds on the auxiliary random variables U and V in Theorem 1 are established by standard application of the Eggleston-Fenchel-Carathéodory theorem [20, Theorem 18] twice. The details are omitted.*

C. Alternative Characterization of Achievable Result

It turns out that R_{A} can be restated in an alternative yet equivalent form that provides additional insight of our results. As before, let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be alphabets with cardinalities bounded as stated in Theorem 1, and for any $Q_{U,V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$ define

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right) \triangleq \min\Big\{I(V; Y|U) - I(V; Z|U), I(U, V; Y) - I(U, V; S)\Big\}, \tag{24}$$

where the mutual information terms are calculated with respect to the joint distribution $W_S Q_{U,V,X|S} W_{Y,Z|X,S}$.

Proposition 1 (Alternative Characterization of R_{A}) *Setting*

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}} \triangleq \max_{\substack{Q_{U,V,X|S}:\\ I(U;Y)-I(U;S)\geq 0}} R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right), \tag{25}$$

it holds that

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}} = R_{\mathrm{A}}. \tag{26}$$

The proof of Proposition 1 is relegated to Appendix A. It is readily observed that $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}} \leq R_{\mathrm{A}}$. This is since two first rate bounds in R_{A} (see (22)) are the same as those defining $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$, while the third bound in R_{A} is obtained by adding the first bound from $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ and the quantity $I(U;Y)-I(U;S)$, which we know is non-negative by (25). For the proof of the opposite inclusion see Appendix A.

The challenge in showing that $R_{\mathrm{A}} \leq R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ comes from the observation that in R_{A} the legitimate user may not be able to reliably decode the (inner) U layer of the superposition codebook by itself. Decoding the U layer in R_{A} is possible, in general, with the assistance of the (outer) V layer. This is evident from the second and third rate bounds in R_{A}, from which it is seen that even if an input distribution $Q_{U,V,X|S}$ induces $I(U;Y) < I(U;S)$, it still might result in a positive achievable rate. In contrast, $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ only allows input distributions with $I(U;Y) \geq I(U;S)$, i.e., distributions that make U decodable on its own by the legitimate user. Nonetheless, as the proof in Appendix A shows that $R_{\mathrm{A}} = R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$, it in particular implies that the optimal input distributions in R_{A} always satisfy $I(U;Y) \geq I(U;S)$.

Recall that the purpose of the inner layer codebook U in the scheme that achieves R_{A} is to make the eavesdropper 'waste' resources on decoding it (which, in turn, produces SS). This is done by having $I(U;Z) > I(U;S)$, where $I(U;S)$ is approximately the rate of the U codebook (that must be at least of that rate, and it is never beneficial to make it larger as it carries no information of the secret message). In that respect, the optimality of coding distributions with $I(U;Y) \geq I(U;S)$ in R_{A} means that a U codebook that is directly decodable by the legitimate user is most beneficial in obscuring the eavesdropper.

Remark 9 (Explicit Achievability for Alternative Rate) *An explicit achievability proof of $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ can be established by repeating the proof of Theorem 1 that establishes R_{A} as a lower bound on the SS-capacity (see Section VI-B), while restricting attention only to input distributions with $I(U;Y) \geq I(U;S)$. This is observed by noting that when $Q_{U,V,X|S}$ induces $I(U;Y) \geq I(U;S)$, the third rate bound in $R_{\mathrm{A}}(Q_{U,V,X|S})$ from* (22) *becomes inactive (due to the first rate bound therein). Proposition 1 then shows that no loss of optimality occurs as a consequence of this restriction on the input distributions.*

Remark 10 (Interpretation of Alternative Rate) *To get some intuition on the structure of $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ notice that $I(V;Y|U)-I(V;Z|U)$ is the total rate of secrecy resources that are produced by the outer layer of the codebook. That is, the outer layer can achieve a secure communication rate of $I(V;Y|U) - \max\left\{I(V;Z|U), I(V;S|U)\right\}$, and it can produce secret key at a rate of $\left[I(V;S|U)-I(V;Z|U)\right]_+$, where $[x]^+ = \max(0,x)$, because some of the dummy bits needed to correlate the transmission with the state are secure for the same reason that a transmission is secure.*

Also, the total amount of reliable (secured and unsecured) communication that this codebook allows is $I(U,V;Y)-I(U,V;S)$, including both the inner and outer layer. Therefore, one interpretation of our encoding scheme is that secret key produced in the outer layer (if any) is applied to the non-secure communication in the inner layer. In total, this achieves a secure communication rate that is the minimum of the total secrecy resources $I(V;Y|U)-I(V;Z|U)$ (i.e. secure communication and secret key) and the total communication rate $I(U,V;Y)-I(U,V;S)$, corresponding to the statement of $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$. Of course, this effect happens naturally by the design of the superposition code, without the need to explicitly extract a key and apply a one-time pad.

V. Special Cases and Examples

A. Comparison to the Encoder and Decoder CSI Case

Consider the case when the state sequence $\mathbf{S}$ is also available to the legitimate receiver, i.e., when Y is replaced with (Y,S). The scenario when the encoder CSI is causal was studies by Chia and El-Gamal in [8], where a lower bound on the weak-secrecy capacity $C_{\mathrm{Weak}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ was established. To restate their result, let $\mathcal{T}$ be a finite set and for any $P_T\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ and $P_{X|T,S}:\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{T}\to\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ define

$$R_{\mathrm{CEG}}\left(P_TP_{X|T,S}\right)\triangleq\min\Big\{I(T;Y|S),H(S|T,Z)+\big[I(T;Y,S)-I(T;Z)\big]^+\Big\},\tag{27a}$$

where $[x]^+=\max(0,x)$ and the mutual information terms are calculated with respect to $W_SP_TP_{X|T,S}W_{Y,Z|X,S}$. Theorem 1 in [8] states that

$$C_{\mathrm{Weak}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\geq R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\triangleq\max_{P_TP_{X|T,S}}R_{\mathrm{CEG}}\left(P_TP_{X|T,S}\right).\tag{27b}$$

The independence between T and S is an outcome of the causality restriction on encoder CSI.

In effect, the result of [8, Theorem 1] was not expressed as in (27). Rather, the authors derived two separate lower bounds on $C_{\mathrm{Weak}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ and stated their achievability result as the maximum between the two. Be it as it may, it is readily verified that (27) is an equivalent representation of [8, Theorem 1]. Furthermore, [8, Remark 3.1] effectively asserts that whenever $I(T;Y,S)\geq I(T;Z)$, allowing correlation between T and S does not result in higher secrecy-rates. However, no such claim was established when the inequality is reversed.

Although studying the causal model, the authors of [8] showed that their result is at least as good as the best previously known scheme for the non-causal encoder CSI scenario. The latter scheme is obtained from [6, Theorem 2] - an achievable weak-secrecy rate for the SC-WTC with non-causal CSI at the encoder only - by replacing Y with (Y,S) (see Remark 2). All the more so, an example was provided in [8] where it is shown that in some cases $R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ achieves strictly higher rates than [6, Theorem 2] (see also [7]). As stated in the following proposition, our achievable formula R_{A} is at least as good as R_{CEG}, when the legitimate receiver also has access to $\mathbf{S}$.

To formulate the relation between the result of Theorem 1 and [8, Theorem 1], we use $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ - the alternative representation of R_{A} presented in Section IV-C. Note that when the legitimate receiver also observes the state

sequence, the constraint on the optimization domain in $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ (see (1)) degenerates. This happens because replacing Y with (Y,S) in (1) the constraint on the input distributions becomes $I(U;Y|S)\geq 0$, which always holds. Consequently, $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ reduces to

$$R_{\mathrm{Alt}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}=\max_{Q_{U,V,X|S}} R_{\mathrm{Alt}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right), \tag{28a}$$

where for any $Q_{U,V,X|S}:\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X})$

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)=\min\Big\{I(V;Y,S|U)-I(V;Z|U),I(U,V;Y|S)-I(U,V;S)\Big\}, \tag{28b}$$

and the mutual information terms are calculated with respect to the same PMF as in Theorem 1.

Proposition 2 *The following relation holds:*

$$R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\leq\max_{P_{T,X|S}} R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(P_{T,X|S}\right)\leq R_{\mathrm{Alt}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}. \tag{29}$$

The proof Proposition 2 is given in Appendix B. The proof shows that $R_{\mathrm{Alt}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ recovers $R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ by either setting $U=T$ and $V=S$ or setting $U=0$ and $V=(T,S)$ (the choice of the auxiliaries varies depending on whether $I(T;Y,S)\leq I(T;Z)$ or not).

A few remarks are at hand regarding the result of Proposition 2:

1) As seen in (29), our formula reduces to a maximization of $R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(P_{T,X|S}\right)$ over a domain of distribution that allow correlation between T and S. This is since our coding scheme was tailored for the non-causal CSI scenario, in contrast to the causal construction from [8] that results in restricting T and S to be independent. Although, this correlation is unnecessary when $I(T;Y,S)\geq I(T;Z)$, it may be the case that a correlated T and S are better when $I(T;Y,S)<I(T;Z)$.
2) The coding scheme in [8] that achieves $R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ uses the state sequence to explicitly generate a key (of the largest rate possible while still keeping the eavesdropper ignorant of it). This key is then used to one-time-pad a part of the confidential message; the other part of the message is protected via a wiretap code (whenever wiretap coding is possible). In contrast, our coding scheme for achieving R_{A} (or $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$, which uses the same encoding - see Remark 9), does not involve any explicit key generation (nor key agreement) phase. Instead, our code is based on a superposition codebook that fully encodes the confidential message in its outer layer, and SS is ensured by making the eavesdropper 'waste' channel resources on the inner layer codeword that carries no confidential information whatsoever. Nonetheless, the relation between our scheme (when adjusted to the encoder-decoder CSI scenario) and the one-time-pad-based scheme from [8] is observed as follows. As mentioned before, in recovering $R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ from $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ we include the state random variable S as part as the auxiliary random variable V. Doing so essentially uses the state sequence to randomize the choice of the transmitted codeword for a prescribed confidential message m. Since $\mathbf{S}$ is also known to the decoder, it can reverse this randomized choice and backtrack to the transmitted message. The eavesdropper, being ignorant of the state sequence, cannot do the same. This is an alternative perspective of the one-time-

pad operation: randomly choosing a codeword from a cluster of codewords associated with each confidential message. Making these clusters large enough (so that they overlap), allows only a party that has access to the randomness used for the randomized choice to isolate the original message. This phenomenon was discussed quantitatively in Remark 10.

3) Our coding scheme results in SS and a vanishing maximal error probability, while achieving possibly higher rates than [8], where only weak-secrecy and a vanishing average error probability were guaranteed. Thus, an upgrade of both performance metrics from [8] is possible, without inflicting any loss of rate. Furthermore, our scheme is based on a *single* transmission block, while [8, Theorem 1] relies on transmitting many such blocks. The purpose of a multiple-block transmission is to generate the key at each block from the state sequence of the previous block, thus simplifying the security analysis as far as the independence of the generated key and the eavesdropper's channel observation.

B. Tight SS-Capacity Results

The result of Theorem 1 is tight for several special cases that are discussed in this section.

1) Less Noisy SD-WTC with Non-Causal Encoder and Decoder CSI: As shown in Section V-A, our result is at least as good as the achievable rates from [8, Theorem 1], for the case when the legitimate decoder also observes the state sequence. Therefore, R_{A} achieves the secrecy-capacity of all the scenarios for which Theorem 1 from [8] is tight. In particular, this includes a class of less noisy SD-WTC $W_{Y,Z|X,S}$ satisfying $I(U;Y|S) \geq I(U;Z|S)$ for every random variable U for which $(U,S)-(X,S)-(Y,Z)$ forms a Markov chain. The weak-secrecy-capacity (under a vanishing average error probability criterion) of this setting is given by [8, Theorem 3]

$$C_{\mathrm{LN}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}} = \max_{P_{X|S}} \min \Big\{ I(X;Y|S), I(X;Y|S) - I(X;Z|S) + H(S|Z) \Big\}, \tag{30}$$

and is recovered from $R_{\mathrm{CEG}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ given in (28) by setting $T = X$. For the special case when the WTC is independent of the state, i.e., when $W_{Y,Z|X,S} = W_{Y,Z|X}$, $C_{\mathrm{LN}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ specializes to the secrecy-capacity for the WTC with a key of rate $H(S)$ [21]. Since $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}$ recovers [8, Theorem 1] while ensuring SS and a vanishing maximal error probability, our result serves as a strengthening of those form [8] to these upgraded performance criteria.

The example the authors of [8] used to show that their scheme may result in strictly higher secrecy rates than the best previously known schemes from the literature [6], [7] considered the opposite case. More precisely, they considered a WTC $W_{Y,Z|X,S} = W_{Y,Z|X}$ that is independent of the state but where the eavesdropper's observation is better than this of the legitimate user, i.e., $X - Z - Y$ forms a Markov chain. Although the example established the superiority of their result over those from [6], [7], the secrecy-capacity of this instance was not established. In the following subsection we show that Theorem 1 is tight for a generalized version of this reversely less noisy SD-WTC.

2) Reversely Less Noisy SD-WTC with Full Encoder and Noisy Decoder and Eavesdropper CSI: Let $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ be finite sets and consider a SD-WTC $W_{\tilde{Y},\tilde{Z}|X,S}$ with non-causal encoder CSI, where $\tilde{Y} = (Y, S_1)$, $\tilde{Z} = (Z, S_2)$ and

$W_{S_1,S_2,Y,Z|X,S} = W_{S_1,S_2|S}W_{Y,Z|X}$. Namely, the transition probability $W_{S_1,S_2,Y,Z|X,S}$ decomposes into a product of two WTCs, one being independent of the state, while the other one depends only on it. The legitimate receiver (respectively, the eavesdropper) observes not only the output $\mathbf{Y}$ (respectively, $\mathbf{Z}$) of the WTC $W^n_{Y,Z|X}$, but also $\mathbf{S}_1$ (respectively, $\mathbf{S}_2$) - a noisy version of the state sequence drawn according to the marginal of $W^n_{S_1,S_2|S}$. We characterize the SS-capacity of this setting when the WTC $W_{Y,Z|X}$ is reversely less noisy, i.e., when $I(U;Y) \leq I(U;Z)$, for every random variable U with $U - X - (Y,Z)$.

In Section V-C we show that this secrecy-capacity result cannot be achieved from the previously known achievable schemes from [6]–[8]. For [8], this conviction is straightforward since the considered setting falls outside the framework of a SD-WTC with full (non-causal) encoder and decoder CSI. The sub-optimality of [6], [7] is illustrated in Section V-C via an explicit example of a reversely less noisy SD-WTC, for which our scheme achieves strictly higher secrecy rates.

To state the SS-capacity result let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be finite sets and for any $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, $P_{A|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ and $P_{B|A} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B})$ define

$$R_{\mathrm{RLN}}\left(P_X, P_{A|S}, P_{B|A}\right) = \min\Big\{I(A;S_1|B) - I(A;S_2|B), I(X;Y) - I(A;S|S_1)\Big\}, \tag{31}$$

where the mutual information terms are calculated with respect to the joint PMF $W_S P_{A|S} P_{B|A} P_X W_{S_1,S_2|S} W_{Y,Z|X}$, i.e., where (X,Y,Z) is independent of (S,S_1,S_2,A,B) and $A-S-(S_1,S_2)$ and $B-A-(S,S_1,S_2)$ form Markov chains (as well as the Markov relations implied by the channels).

Corollary 1 (Reversely Less Noisy SD-WTC SS-Capacity) *The SS-capacity of the reversely less noisy WTC with full encoder and noisy decoder and eavesdropper CSI is*

$$C_{\mathrm{RLN}} = \max_{P_X, P_{A|S}, P_{B|A}} R_{\mathrm{RLN}}\left(P_X, P_{A|S}, P_{B|A}\right). \tag{32}$$

A proof of Corollary 1, where the direct part is established based on Theorem 1, is given in Appendix C. Instead, one can derive an explicit achievability for (32) via a coding scheme based on a key agreement protocol via multiple blocks and a one-time-pad operation. To gain some intuition, an outline of the scheme for the simplified case where $S_2 = 0$ is described in the following remark. This scenario is fitting for intuitive purposes since the absence of correlated observations with S at the eavesdropper's site allows to design an explicit secured protocol over a signle transmission block. We note however, the even when S_2 is not a constant, a single-block-based coding scheme is feasible via the superposition code construction in the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark 11 (Explicit Achievability for Corollary 1) *It is readily verified that when $S_2 = 0$, setting $B = 0$ into* (32) *is optimal. The resulting secrecy rate $\tilde{R}_{\mathrm{RLN}}\left(P_X, P_{A|S}\right) \triangleq \min\Big\{I(A;S_1), I(X;Y) - I(A;S|S_1)\Big\}$, for any fixed P_X and $P_{A|S}$ as before, is achieved as follows:*

1) *Generate 2^{nR_A} a-codewords as i.i.d. samples of P^n_A.*

2) *Partition the set of all a-codewords into $2^{nR_{\rm Bin}}$ equal sized bins. Accordingly, label each a-codeword as $\mathbf{a}(b,k)$, where $b \in \left[1:2^{nR_{\rm Bin}}\right]$ and $k \in \left[1:2^{n(R_A-R_{\rm Bin})}\right]$.*
3) *Generate a point-to-point codebook that comprises $2^{n(R+R_{\rm Bin})}$ codewords $\mathbf{x}(m,b)$, where $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and $b \in \left[1:2^{nR_{\rm Bin}}\right]$, drawn according to P_X^n.*
4) *Upon observing the state sequence $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}^n$, the encoder searches the entire a-codebook for an a-codeword that is jointly-typical with $\mathbf{s}$, with respect to their joint PMF $W_S P_{A|S}$. Such a codeword is found with high probability provided that*

$$R_A > I(A;S). \tag{33}$$

Let $(b,k) \in \left[1:2^{nR_{\rm Bin}}\right] \times \left[1:2^{n(R_A-R_{\rm Bin})}\right]$ be the indices of the selected a-codeword. To sent the message $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$, the encoder one-time-pads m with k to get $\tilde{m} = m \oplus k \in \mathcal{M}_n$, and transmits $\mathbf{x}(\tilde{m},b)$ over the WTC. The one-time-pad operation restricts the rates to satisfy

$$R \le R_A - R_{\rm Bin}. \tag{34}$$

5) *The legitimate receiver first decodes the x-codeword using it's channel observation $\mathbf{y}$. An error-free decoding requires the total number of x-codewords to be less than the capacity of the sub-channel $W_{Y|X}$, i.e.,*

$$R + R_{\rm Bin} < I(X;Y). \tag{35}$$

Denoting the decoded indices by $(\hat{\tilde{m}},\hat{b}) \in \mathcal{M}_n \times \left[1:2^{nR_{\rm Bin}}\right]$, the decoder then uses the noisy state observation $\mathbf{s}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1^n$ to isolate the exact a-codeword from the $\hat{b}$-th bin. Namely, it searches for a unique index $\hat{k} \in \left[1:2^{n(R_A-R_{\rm Bin})}\right]$, such that $\left(\mathbf{a}(\hat{b},\hat{k}),\mathbf{s}_1\right)$ are jointly-typical with respect to the PMF P_{A,S_1} the marginal of $W_S W_{S_1|S} P_{A|S}$. The probability of error in doing so is arbitrarily small with the blocklength provided that

$$R_A - R_{\rm Bin} < I(A;S_1). \tag{36}$$

Having decoded $(\hat{\tilde{m}},\hat{b})$ and $\hat{k}$, the decoder declares $\hat{m} \triangleq \hat{\tilde{m}} \oplus \hat{k}$ as the decoded message.
6) *For the eavesdropper, note that although the it has the correct $(\tilde{m},b)$ (due to the less noisy condition), it cannot decode k since it has no observation that is correlated with the A, S and S_1 random variables. Security of the protocol is implies by the security of the one-time-pad operation.*
7) *Putting the aforementioned rate bounds together establishes the achievability of $\tilde{R}_{\rm RLN}\left(P_X, P_{A|S}\right)$.*

To the best of our knowledge, the result of Corollary 1 was not established before. It is, however, strongly related to [22], where a similar model was considered for the purpose of key generation (rather than the transmission of a confidential message). In particular, [22] established lower and upper bounds on the secret-key capacity of the reversely less noisy WTC with noisy decoder and eavesdropper CSI. The code construction proposed in [22] is reminiscent of this described in Remark 11 (with the proper adjustments for the key-agreement task).

Remark 12 *We refer back to the example from [8] used to demonstrate the superiority of their result over previous*

non-causal schemes [6], [7]. The WTC considered in the example is independent of the state with $Z = X$ that is further fed into a binary symmetric channel (BSC) to produce the output Y. Corollary 1 captures this instance as a special case by taking $S_1 = S$, $S_2 = 0$ and setting $W_{Y,Z|X}$ as mentioned. This characterizes the SS-capacity as

$$\tilde{R}_{\mathrm{RLN}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}} = \max_{P_X} \min \Big\{ H(S), I(X;Y) \Big\}. \tag{37}$$

In essence, the example from [8] showed that while their proposed scheme is able to operate at the rate from (37)*, the schemes from [6], [7] are unable to do the same. The optimality of* (37) *was not established in [8].*

3) Semi-Deterministic SD-WTC with Non-Causal Encoder CSI: Another observation is that R_{A} from Theorem 1 is tight when the main channel is deterministic, i.e., when $W_{Y,Z|X,S} = \mathbb{1}_{\left\{Y=g(X,S)\right\}} W_{Z|X,S}$, for some function $g : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$. In fact, the achievability results from [6], [7] are sufficient for achieving optimality in this case. We state this secrecy-capacity result merely because, to the best of our knowledge, it was not explicitly stated before.

Corollary 2 (Semi-Deterministic SD-WTC with Non-Causal Encoder CSI - SS-Capacity) *The SS-capacity of the semi-deterministic SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI is*

$$C_{\mathrm{Semi-Det}} = \max_{P_{X|S}} \min \Big\{ H(Y|Z), H(Y|S) \Big\}, \tag{38}$$

where the entropy terms are calculated with respect to $W_S P_{X|S} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{Y=g(X,S)\right\}} W_{Z|X,S}$.

The achievability of $C_{\mathrm{Semi-Det}}$ follows by setting $U = 0$ and $V = Y$ (which is a valid choice due to the deterministic nature of the main channel) in Theorem 1. The converse is also easily established by standard techniques - see Appendix D.

Note that the SS-capacity is unaffected by whether the eavesdropper's channel is deterministic or not. Letting $Z = h(X, S)$, for some $h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Z}$ does not changes the result of Corollary 2.

C. Comparison to Previous Schemes for the SD-WTC with Non-Causal Encoder CSI

The result of Theorem 1 recovers the previously best known achievable formula for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI by Chen and Han Vinck from [6, Theorem 2]. Moreover, we show that for some SD-WTC our achievability is strictly better than [6, Theorem 2]. The latter result states that the weak-secrecy capacity of the considered SD-WTC is lower bounded by

$$R_{\mathrm{CHV}}^{\mathrm{Enc-CSI}} \triangleq \max_{P_{V,X|S}} R_{\mathrm{CHV}}^{\mathrm{Enc-CSI}} \left(P_{V,X|S} \right), \tag{39a}$$

where for any $P_{V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$,

$$R_{\mathrm{CHV}}^{\mathrm{Enc-CSI}} \left(P_{V,X|S} \right) \triangleq \min \Big\{ I(V;Y) - I(V;Z), I(V;Y) - I(V;S), \Big\}, \tag{39b}$$

and the mutual information terms are taken with respect to $W_S P_{V,X|S} W_{Y,Z|X,S}$, i.e., $V - (X, S) - (Y, Z)$ forms a Markov Chain. This result was generalized in [7, Theorem 1] to the case where the SD-WTC is governed by




Fig. 3. A reversely less noisy SD-WTC with a BSC(α), $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, connecting X and Y, and a BEC(σ), $\sigma \in (0,1)$ connection S and S_1. The state random variable S has entropy $H(S) = 1 - h(\alpha)$.

a pair of pairwise i.i.d. state sequences $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{S}_1)$ with distribution W^n_{S,S_1} (i.e., the SD-WTC's transition matrix is $W_{\tilde{Y},Z|X,S,S_1}$), the encoder is assumed to have non-causal access to $\mathbf{S}$, while the legitimate receiver has $\mathbf{S}_1$. However, as explained in Remark 2, this instance is a special case of the channel from [6] obtained by taking $Y = (\tilde{Y}, S_1)$ and setting $W_{Y,Z|X,S} = W_{(\tilde{Y},S_1),Z|X,S} = W_{S_1|S} W_{\tilde{Y},Z|X,S,S_1}$. For this reason, we henceforth focus on [6] for the comparison.

First note that Theorem 1 recovers $R_{\mathrm{CHV}}^{\mathrm{Enc-CSI}}$ by setting $U = 0$ in R_{A}. Consequently,

$$R_{\mathrm{A}} \geq R_{\mathrm{CHV}}^{\mathrm{Enc-CSI}}. \tag{40}$$

On top of this observation, the following example shows that there exist SD-WTCs for which the inequality in (40) is strict. The example is an instance of a reversely less noisy SD-WTC from Section V-B2, where the legitimate receiver observes a noisy version of the state sequence. The eavesdropper, however, receives no output from the channel $W_{S_1,S_2|S}$, a fact modeled by setting $S_2 = 0$. Our example falls outside of the framework of [8], where the legitimate users share the same CSI.

Example: Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Z} = \{0,1\}$, $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{0,1,?\}$, where $? \notin \{0,1\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{0\}$. Consider the reversely less noisy SD-WTC $W_{S_1,S_2|S} W_{Y,Z|X}$ from Section V-B2 defined by two parameters $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ and $\sigma \in (0,1)$ as follows:

- $S \sim \mathrm{Ber}(p_\alpha)$, where $p_\alpha = h^{-1}\Big(1 - h(\alpha)\Big) \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, h is the binary entropy function and h^{-1} is the inverse of the restriction of h to $\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$.
- $S_2 = 0$ with probability 1 (i.e., a degenerate random variable). Thus, the channel $W_{S_1,S_2|S}$ produces no information-carrying output at the eavesdropper's site.
- $Z = X$, i.e., the eavesdropper noiselessly observes the transmitted symbol X.
- $W_{Y|X}$ is a BSC with crossover probability $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ (abbreviated as a BSC(α)).
- $W_{S_1|S}$ is a binary erasure channel with erasure probability $\sigma \in (0,1)$ (abbreviated as a BEC(σ)).

The considered SD-WTC is depicted in Fig. 3 and its SS-capacity is denoted by $C_{\mathrm{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)$. Since $S_2=0$, by Remark 11 we have that

$$C_{\mathrm{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)=\max_{P_X,P_{A|S}}\min\Big\{I(A;S_1),I(X;Y)-I(A;S|S_1)\Big\}. \tag{41}$$

Proposition 3 *For any $\alpha\in\big(0,\frac{1}{2}\big)$ and $\sigma\in(0,1)$, the SS-capacity of the reversely less noisy SD-WTC described above is*

$$C_{\mathrm{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)=\bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big], \tag{42}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}=1-\sigma$.

Proof: For the direct part fix $\alpha\in\big(0,\frac{1}{2}\big)$ and $\sigma\in(0,1)$, let $X\sim\mathrm{Ber}\big(\frac{1}{2}\big)$ and set $A=S$. Let $E_\sigma\sim\mathrm{Ber}(\sigma)$ be a random variable independent of S that defines when $S_1=?$, i.e.,

$$S_1=\begin{cases}S, & E_\sigma=0\\ ?, & E_\sigma=1\end{cases}. \tag{43}$$

Since E_σ is determined by S_1 and is independent of S, we have

$$I(S;S_1)=I(S;S_1,E_\sigma)=I(S;S_1|E_\sigma)=\bar{\sigma}I(S;S|E_\sigma=0)+\sigma I(S;?|E_\sigma=1)=\bar{\sigma}H(S)=\bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]. \tag{44}$$

By similar steps we also obtain

$$I(A;S|S_1)=I(S;S|S_1,E_\sigma)=\bar{\sigma}H(S|S,E_\sigma=0)+\sigma H(S|?,E_\sigma=1)=\sigma\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]. \tag{45}$$

Inserting (44)-(45) along with $I(X;Y)=1-h(\alpha)$ into (42), gives

$$C_{\mathrm{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)\geq\bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]. \tag{46}$$

The converse is straightforward as for any $\alpha\in\big(0,\frac{1}{2}\big)$ and $\sigma\in(0,1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}C_{\mathrm{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)&=\max_{P_X,P_{A|S}}\min\Big\{I(A;S_1),I(X;Y)-I(A;S|S_1)\Big\}\\&\leq\max_{P_{A|S}}I(A;S_1)\\&\overset{(a)}{=}\max_{P_{A|S}}\bar{\sigma}I(A;S)\\&\leq\bar{\sigma}H(S)\\&=\bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big],\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where (a) follows by similar step as (44), while using the independence of A and E_σ (which itself is a consequence of S and E_σ being independent and $A-S-(S_1,E_\sigma)$ forming a Markov chain). ■

Having a simple expression for $C_{\mathrm{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)$, we now move on to show that the SS-capacity cannot be achieved

by $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}}$ from (39). This will provide an explicit example outside the framework of [8] (where the state was known both at the transmitting and receiving) where the result from [6] is sub-optimal. For the considered SD-WTC, (39b) becomes

$$R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}}\left(P_{V,X|S}\right) \triangleq \min\Big\{I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;X), I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;S)\Big\}, \tag{48}$$

and the corresponding joint distribution is $W_S P_{V,X|S} W_{S_1|S} W_{Y|X}$. Assume by contradiction that $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}} \geq \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]$ and consider the two following cases:

Case 1: For any $P_{V,X|S}: \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X})$ with $I(V;Y) \leq I(V;S)$, we start by upper bounding the second term in the minimum from the RHS of (48) as

$$\begin{aligned}
I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;S) &\overset{(a)}{=} I(V;Y|S_1)-I(V;S|S_1) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \bar{\sigma}\Big[I(V;Y|S)-I(V;S|S)\Big]+\sigma\Big[I(V;Y)-I(V;S)\Big] \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} \bar{\sigma} I(V;Y|S) \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} \bar{\sigma} I(V,S;Y) \\
&\overset{(e)}{\leq} \bar{\sigma} I(X;Y) \\
&\overset{(f)}{=} \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

where:

(a) is because $V-S-S_1$ forms a Markov chain;

(b) follows by similar steps as in (44), while using the independence of E_σ and (V,S,X,Y);

(c) uses the assumption in Case 1 that $I(V;Y) \leq I(V;S)$;

(d) adds the quantity $\bar{\sigma} I(S;Y)$;

(e) uses the Markov chain $(V,S)-X-Y$;

(f) follows because $I(X;Y)$ is upper bounded by the capacity of the BSC(α).

Thus, to satisfy $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}} \geq \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]$, it must be true that $I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;S) = \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]$, for any $P_{V,X|S}$ with $I(V;Y) \leq I(V;S)$. An end-to-end equality must, therefore, hold in the chain of inequalities from (49). In particular, we have

- (d) holds with equality if and only if S and Y are independent.
- (e) holds with equality if and only if $I(X;Y|V,S)=0$, which is equivalent to $X-(V,S)-Y$ forming a Markov chain.
- (f) holds with equality if and only if $X \sim \text{Ber}\big(\frac{1}{2}\big)$.

The following lemma specifies some properties that are implied by the above relations. The proof of Lemma 2 is proven in Appendix E

Lemma 2 *The following implications hold:*

1) *S and Y are independent $\implies$ S and X are independent.*

2) *$X-(V,S)-Y$ and $(V,S)-X-Y$ form Markov chains $\implies$ $\exists\ g:\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{X}$ such that $X=f(V,S)$.*

Based on Lemma 2, we upper bound the first expression in the minimum from the RHS of (48) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;X) &= I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;S)+I(V;S)-I(V;X)\\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]+I(V;S)-I(V;X)\\
&= \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]+I(V;S|X)-I(V;X|S)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]+H(S)-I(V;X|S)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]+H(S)-H(X)\\
&\overset{(d)}{=} \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]+1-h(\alpha)-1\\
&< \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big] \qquad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

where:

(a) follows by the end-to-end equality in (49);

(b) uses the independence of S and X and the non-negativity of entropy;

(c) again relies on X and S being independent and on $X=f(V,S)$;

(d) is because $H(S)=1-h(\alpha)$ and $X\sim \text{Ber}\big(\frac{1}{2}\big)$.

The strict inequality in (50) is in contradiction to $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}}\geq C_{\text{RLN}}(\alpha,\sigma)$ since $\alpha\in\big(0,\frac{1}{2}\big)$, which means that $h(\alpha)>0$.

Case 2: For any $P_{V,X|S}:\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X})$ with $I(V;Y)>I(V;S)$, consider the following upper bound on the first term in the minimum from the RHS of (48). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;X) &\overset{(a)}{=} I(V;S_1|Y)-I(V;X|Y)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} I(V;S_1|Y)\\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(V,Y;S_1)\\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} I(S;S_1)\\
&\overset{(e)}{=} \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big] \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

where:

(a) is because $V-X-Y$ forms a Markov chain;

(b) is due to the non-negativity of mutual information;

(c) adds the quantity $I(Y;S_1)$;

(d) uses the Markov chain $(V,Y)-S-S_1$;

(e) follows by (44).

As before, since $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}} \geq \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]$ and (51) both hold, it must be the case that $I(V;Y,S_1)-I(V;X)=\bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]$, for any $P_{V,X|S}$ with $I(V;Y)>I(V;S)$. An end-to-end equality in (49) is equivalent to the following:

- (b) holds with equality if and only if $I(V;X|Y)=0$, which is equivalent to the Markov chain $X-V-Y$.
- (c) holds with equality if and only if S_1 and Y are independent.
- (d) holds with equality if and only if $I(S;S_1|V,Y)=0$, which is equivalent to $S-(V,Y)-S_1$ forming a Markov chain.

Lemma 3 (proven in Appendix F) gives additional properties that are implied by the above relations.

Lemma 3 *The following implications hold:*

1) $X-V-Y$ *and* $V-X-Y$ *form Markov chains* $\implies \exists\ g_1:\mathcal{V}\to\mathcal{X}$ *such that* $X=g_1(V)$.
2) S_1 *and* Y *are independent* $\implies$ S *and* Y *are independent.*
3) $S-(V,Y)-S_1$ *and* $(V,Y)-S-S_1$ *form Markov chains* $\implies \exists\ g_2:\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{Y}\to\mathcal{S}$ *such that* $S=g_2(V,Y)$.

Using properties from Lemma 3, we upper bound $I(V;Y)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} I(V;Y) &= H(V)-H(V|Y) \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} H(V)-H(V,S|Y) \\ &= I(V;S,Y)-H(S|Y) \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} I(V;S)+I(V;Y|S)-H(S) \\ &\overset{(c)}{=} I(V;S)+I(V,S;Y)-H(S) \\ &\overset{(d)}{\leq} I(V;S)+I(X;Y)-H(S) \\ &\overset{(e)}{\leq} I(V;S) \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where:

(a) is because $S=g_2(V,Y)$;

(b) and (c) use the independence of S and Y;

(d) follows because $(V,S)-X-Y$ forms a Markov chain;

(e) is since $I(X;Y)\leq 1-h(\alpha)$, while $H(S)=1-h(\alpha)$.

The inequality in (52) is in contradiction to $P_{V,X|S}$ in Case 2 being such that $I(V;Y)>I(V;S)$. The contradictions in both cases imply that $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}} < \bar{\sigma}\big[1-h(\alpha)\big]$, i.e., that $R_{\text{CHV}}^{\text{Enc}-\text{CSI}}$ is sub-optimal for the considered example.

VI. PROOFS

A. Proof of Lemma 1

We state the proof in terms of arbitrary distributions (not necessarily discrete). When needed, we will specialize to the case that $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are finite. For any fixed superposition codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$, let the Radon-Nikodym derivative between the induced and desired distributions be denoted as

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n}(\mathbf{w}) \triangleq \frac{dP_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}{dQ_W^n}(\mathbf{w}). \tag{53}$$

In the discrete case, this is just a ratio of probability mass functions. Accordingly, the relative entropy of interest, which is a function of the codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$, is given by

$$D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big\|Q_W^n\Big) = \int dP_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} \log \Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n}. \tag{54}$$

To describe the jointly-typical set over u-, v- and w-sequences, we first define information density $i_{Q_{W|U}} : \mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{W}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ and $i_{Q_{W|U,V}} : \mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{W}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$i_{Q_{U,W}}(u,w) := \log\left(\frac{dQ_{W|U=u}}{dQ_W}(w)\right), \tag{55a}$$

$$i_{Q_{U,V,W}}(u,v,w) := \log\left(\frac{dQ_{W|U=u,V=v}}{dQ_W}(w)\right). \tag{55b}$$

In (55), the arguments of the logarithms are the Radon-Nikodym derivatives between $Q_{W|U=u}$ and Q_W and $Q_{W|U=u,V=v}$ and Q_W, respectively. Let $\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2\geq 0$ be arbitrary, to be determined later, and define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2} \triangleq \left\{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})\in\mathcal{U}^n\times\mathcal{V}^n\times\mathcal{W}^n \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{n}i_{Q^n_{U,W}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) < I(U;W)+\epsilon_1 \\ \frac{1}{n}i_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}) < I(U,V;W)+\epsilon_2 \end{array}\right\}, \tag{56}$$

and note that

$$i_{Q^n_{U,W}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,W}}(u_t,w_t), \tag{57a}$$

$$i_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,V,W}}(u_t,v_t,w_t), \tag{57b}$$

We split $P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ into two parts, making use of the indicator function. For every $\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n$, define

$$P_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{v}) := 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} Q^n_{W|U,V}\big(\mathbf{w}\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)\big)\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\left(\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V),\mathbf{w}\right)\in\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\right\}}, \tag{58a}$$

$$P_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}(\mathbf{v}) := 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} Q^n_{W|U,V}\big(\mathbf{w}\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)\big)\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\left(\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V),\mathbf{w}\right)\notin\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\right\}}. \tag{58b}$$

The measures $P_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}$ and $P_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}$ on the space $\mathcal{W}^n$ are not probability measures, but $P_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}+P_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}=P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ for each

codebook $\mathcal{B}$. We also split $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n}$ into two parts. Namely, for every $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}^n$, we set

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,j}(\mathbf{w}) := \frac{dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,j}}{dQ_W^n}(\mathbf{w}), \quad j = 1, 2. \tag{59}$$

With respect to the above definitions, Lemma 4 states an upper bound on the relative entropy of interest.

Lemma 4 *For every fixed superposition codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$, we have*

$$D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big\|Q_W^n\Big) \le h\left(\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\right) + \int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\log\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,1} + \int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\log\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}, \tag{60}$$

where $h(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy function.

The proof of the lemma is omitted as it follows the same steps as in the proof of [14, Lemma 2] (see Appendix A therein for details). Based on Lemma 4, if the relative entropy of interest does not decay exponentially fast, then the same is true for the terms on the right-hand side (RHS) of (60). Therefore, to establish Lemma 1, its suffices to show that the probability (with respect to a random superposition codebook) of the RHS not vanishing exponentially fast to 0 as $n \to \infty$, is double-exponentially small.

Notice that $P_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}$ usually contains almost all of the probability. That is, for any fixed $\mathcal{B}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2} = 1 - \int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\\ &= \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{W|U,V}}\Big(\big(\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V),\mathbf{W}\big)\notin\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\Big|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

For a random codebook, (61) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}&\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\\ &= \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{W|U,V}}\Big(\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V),\mathbf{W}\big)\notin\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\Big|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{V}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where the RHS is an average of exponentially many i.i.d. random variables bounded between 0 and 1. Furthermore, the expected value of each one is the exponentially small probability of correlated sequences being atypical:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{W|U,V}}\Big(\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V),\mathbf{W}\big)\notin\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\Big|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\Big)\\ &= \mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}\Big(\big(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{W}\big)\notin\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\Big)\\ &= \mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}\left(\left\{\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,W}}(U_t,W_t)\ge n\big(I(U;W)+\epsilon_1\big)\right\}\cup\left\{\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,V,W}}(U_t,V_t,W_t)\ge n\big(I(U,V;W)+\epsilon_2\big)\right\}\right)\\ &\le \mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}\Big(2^{\lambda\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,W}}(U_t,W_t)}\ge 2^{n\lambda(I(U;W)+\epsilon_1)}\Big)+\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}\Big(2^{\lambda\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,V,W}}(U_t,V_t,W_t)}\ge 2^{n\lambda(I(U,V;W)+\epsilon_2)}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where the last inequality uses the union bound and is true for any $\lambda \ge 0$. We further bound the two probability

terms from the RHS of (63)by exponentially decaying functions of n as follows. For the first term consider:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}\left(2^{\lambda\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,W}}(U_t,W_t)} \geq 2^{n\lambda(I(U;W)+\epsilon_1)}\right) &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{Q^n_{U,W}} 2^{\lambda\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,W}}(U_t,W_t)}}{2^{n\lambda(I(U;W)+\epsilon_1)}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{Q_{U,W}} 2^{\lambda i_{Q_{U,W}}(U,W)}}{2^{\lambda(I(U;W)+\epsilon_1)}}\right)^n \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} 2^{n\lambda\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\log_2 \mathbb{E}_{Q_{U,W}}\left[2^{\lambda i_{Q_{U,W}}(U;W)}\right]-I(U;W)-\epsilon_1\right)} \\ &\overset{(c)}{=} 2^{n\lambda\left(d_{\lambda+1}(Q_{U,W},Q_UQ_W)-I(U;W)-\epsilon_1\right)}, \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where (a) is Markov's inequality, (b) follows by restricting λ to be strictly positive, while (c) is from the definition of the Rényi divergence of order $\lambda+1$. We use units of bits for mutual information and Rényi divergence to coincide with the base two expression of rate. Similarly, the second term from the RHS of (63) is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,W}}\left(2^{\lambda\sum_{t=1}^n i_{Q_{U,V,W}}(U_t,V_t,W_t)} \geq 2^{n\lambda(I(U,V;W)+\epsilon_2)}\right) \leq 2^{n\lambda\left(d_{\lambda+1}(Q_{U,V,W},Q_{U,V}Q_W)-I(U,V;W)-\epsilon_2\right)}. \tag{65}$$

Now, substituting $\alpha = \lambda + 1$ into (64)-(65) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{W|U,V}}\Big(\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V),\mathbf{W}\big) \notin \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}\Big|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\Big) \leq 2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\epsilon_1}} + 2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\epsilon_2}}, \tag{66}$$

where

$$\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\epsilon_1} = (\alpha-1)\big(I(U;W)+\epsilon_1 - d_\alpha(Q_{U,W},Q_UQ_W)\big), \tag{67a}$$

$$\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\epsilon_2} = (\alpha-1)\big(I(U,V;W)+\epsilon_2 - d_\alpha(Q_{U,V,W},Q_{U,V}Q_W)\big), \tag{67b}$$

for every $\alpha > 1$ and $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \geq 0$, over which we may optimize. The optimal choices of ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 are apparent when all bounds of the proof are considered together (some yet to be derived), but the formula may seem arbitrary at the moment. Nevertheless, fix $\delta_1 \in \big(0, R_1 - I(U;W)\big)$ and $\delta_2 \in \big(0, R_1+R_2-I(U,V;W)\big)$, as found in the theorem statement, and for any $\alpha > 1$ set

$$\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(R_1-\delta_1)+(\alpha-1)d_\alpha(Q_{U,W},Q_UQ_W)}{\frac{1}{2}+(\alpha-1)} - I(U;W), \tag{68a}$$

$$\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(R_1+R_2-\delta_2)+(\alpha-1)d_\alpha(Q_{U,V,W},Q_{U,V}Q_W)}{\frac{1}{2}+(\alpha-1)} - I(U,V;W). \tag{68b}$$

Substituting into $\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\epsilon_1}$ and $\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\epsilon_2}$ gives

$$\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1} \triangleq \beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}} = \frac{\alpha-1}{2\alpha-1}\big(R_1-\delta_1-d_\alpha(Q_{U,W},Q_UQ_W)\big), \tag{69a}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_2} \triangleq \beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}} = \frac{\alpha-1}{2\alpha-1}\big(R_1+R_2-\delta_2-d_\alpha(Q_{U,V,W},Q_{U,V}Q_W)\big). \tag{69b}$$

Observe that $\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}$ and $\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}$ in (68) are nonnegative. For example, $\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1} \geq 0$ due to the assumption that $R_1-\delta_1 > I(U;W)$, because $\alpha > 1$ and $d_\alpha(Q_{U,W},Q_WQ_V) \geq d_1(Q_{W,V},Q_UQ_W) = I(U;W)$.

Furthermore, the properties of Rényi divergence imply the existence of an $\alpha > 1$, for which (69a) and (69b) are strictly positive.

Lemma 5 (Strictly Positive Exponents) *There exists an $\alpha > 1$ such that $\beta^{(j)}_{\alpha,\delta_j} > 0$, for $j = 1, 2$.*

Lemma 5 is proven in Appendix G and shows that the RHS of (66) can be made an exponentially decaying function of n. To bound the probability (with respect to a random superposition codebook) of (62) not producing this exponential decay, we use one of the Chernoff bounds stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 6 (Chernoff Bound) *Let $\{X_m\}_{m=1}^M$ be a collection of i.i.d. random variables with $X_m \in [0, B]$ and $\mathbb{E}X_m \leq \mu \neq 0$, for all $m \in [1 : M]$. Then for any c with $\frac{c}{\mu} \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} X_m \geq c\right) \leq e^{-\frac{M\mu}{B}\left(\frac{c}{\mu}\left(\ln\frac{c}{\mu}-1\right)+1\right)}. \tag{70a}$$

Furthermore, if $\frac{c}{\mu} \in [1, 2]$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} X_m \geq c\right) \leq e^{-\frac{M\mu}{3B}\left(\frac{c}{\mu}-1\right)^2}. \tag{70b}$$

For the proof of the bounds see [14, Appendix C] (Equation (119) therein proves the first bound, while (122) establishes the second). Having Lemma 6, we show that $\int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,2}$ is exponentially small with probability doubly-exponentially close to 1. To do so we exploit the fact that for any $j \in \mathcal{J}_n$, the structure of the superposition code implies that the collection $\left\{\left(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U), \mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\right)\right\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$ comprises i.i.d. pairs of random variables. Consequently, denoting

$$f(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \triangleq \mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{W|U,V}}\Big((\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{W}) \notin \mathcal{A}^{(1)}_{\epsilon_{\alpha,\delta_1},\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}} \Big| \mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{V}=\mathbf{v}\Big), \tag{71}$$

we have that $\left\{f\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U), \mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)\right\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$ are i.i.d. for any $j \in \mathcal{J}_n$, and that

$$\mathbb{E}f\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U), \mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \leq 2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}} + 2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}, \quad \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{J}_n. \tag{72}$$

For any $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ consider now the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,2} \geq c\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} f\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U), \mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n}\left\{2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} f\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U), \mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c\cdot 2^{-nR_2}\right\}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} \mathbb{P}\left(2^{-nR_1} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} f\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U), \mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where the last inequality is the union bound. Using (70b) on each of the summands from the RHS of (73) with

$M = 2^{nR_1}$, $\mu = 2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}} + 2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}$, $B = 1$, and $\frac{c}{\mu} = 2$, gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(2^{-nR_1}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} f\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq 2\cdot\left(2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}} + 2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right)\right) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{nR_1}\left(2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}}+2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right)}$$
$$\leq e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}}. \tag{74}$$

Inserting (74) into (73), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,2} \geq 2\cdot\left(2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}} + 2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right)\right) \leq 2^{nR_2}\cdot e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}}, \tag{75}$$

for which $\alpha > 1$ can be chosen to produce a double-exponential convergence to 0 of the RHS because

$$R_1 - \beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1} = \frac{\alpha R_1 + (\alpha-1)\big(\delta_1 + d_\alpha(Q_{U,W}, Q_U Q_W)\big)}{2\alpha - 1} > 0, \quad \forall \alpha > 1. \tag{76}$$

We now move on to treat the random variables $\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w})$, where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}^n$, and show that the it also decays exponentially fast with probability doubly-exponentially close to 1. To simplify notation, for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}^n$, let $g_{\mathbf{w}} : \mathcal{U}^n \times \mathcal{V}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a function specified by

$$g_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) = \frac{dQ_{W|U=\mathbf{u},V=\mathbf{v}}}{dQ_W^n}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{1}\left\{\big(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}\big)\in\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1},\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right\}. \tag{77}$$

Accordingly, note that

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w}) = 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) = 2^{-nR_1}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}\left[2^{-nR_2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)\right], \tag{78}$$

where the RHS is an average of 2^{nR_1} i.i.d. random variables due to the structure of the superposition codebook. Next, for any $c' \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ define

$$\mathcal{D}_i(c') = \left\{2^{-nR_2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c'\cdot 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}\right\}, \tag{79a}$$

and set

$$\mathcal{D}(c') = \bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}\mathcal{D}_i(c'). \tag{79b}$$

Consider the following upper bound on the probability that $\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w})$ is lower bounded by some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}^n$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w}) \geq c\Big)$$
$$= \mathbb{P}\left(2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathcal{D}(c')\Big) + \mathbb{P}\left(2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c \,\middle|\, \mathcal{D}(c')^c\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} \mathbb{P}\left(2^{-nR_2} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c'\cdot 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left(2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c \,\middle|\, \mathcal{D}(c')^c\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} \int_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{U}^n} d\,\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big) \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\left(2^{-nR_2} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big) \geq c'\cdot 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)} \,\middle|\, \mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\right)}_{P_1(i,\mathbf{u})} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\left(2^{-nR_1} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} \left[2^{-nR_2} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)\right] \geq c \,\middle|\, \forall i\in\mathcal{I},\ \mathcal{D}_i(c')^c\right)}_{P_2}
\end{aligned}
\tag{80}
$$

To invoke the Chernoff bound from (70a) on $P_1(i,\mathbf{u})$, where $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^n$, first note that conditioned on $\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U) = \mathbf{u}$, $\big\{g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)\big\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n}$ are i.i.d. Furthermore, each random variable $g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)$ is upper bounded by $2^{n\left(I(U,V;W)+\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right)}$ with probability 1, and has an expectation that is upper bounded as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)\Big|\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big] \\
&\qquad = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{dQ_{W|U=\mathbf{u},V=\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)}}{dQ_W^n}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{1}\left\{\big(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V),\mathbf{w}\big)\in\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1},\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right\}\middle|\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\right] \\
&\qquad \leq \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\frac{dQ^n_{W|U=\mathbf{u}}}{dQ^n_W}(\mathbf{w})\leq 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}\right\}} \frac{dQ_{W|U=\mathbf{u}}}{dQ_W^n}(\mathbf{w}) \\
&\qquad \leq 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{81}
$$

Using (70a) with $M = 2^{nR_2}$, $\mu = 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}$, $B = 2^{n\left(I(U,V;W)+\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right)}$, and $c = c'\cdot\mu$, for any $c' \geq \frac{1}{\mu}$, gives

$$
P_1(i,\mathbf{u}) \leq e^{-2^{n\left(R_2-I(V;W|U)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}-\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right)}\left(c'(\ln c'-1)+1\right)}, \quad \forall (i,\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{U}^n. \tag{82}
$$

Next, for P_2, we have that $\left\{2^{-nR_2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)\right\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$ are i.i.d. by the codebook construction. The conditioning on $\mathcal{D}(c')^c$ implies that each random variable $2^{-nR_2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n} g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)$, for $i\in\mathcal{I}_n$, is bounded between 0 and $c'\cdot 2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}$, with probability 1. The expected value of each term with respect to the codebook is bounded above by one, which is observed by removing the indicator function from

$g_{\mathbf{w}}\big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U),\mathbf{V}(i,j,\mathbb{B}_V)\big)$. Setting $M=2^{nR_1}$, $\mu=1$, $B=2^{n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}$, and any $c\in[1,2]$ into (70b), gives

$$P_2 \le e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-I(U;W)-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}(c-1)^2}. \tag{83}$$

Inserting (82) and (83) into (80), we have that for any $\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n$, $c\in[1,2]$ and $c'\ge 2^{-n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w})\ge c\Big) \le 2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\left(R_2-I(V;W|U)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}-\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right)}\left(c'(\ln c'-1)+1\right)} + e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-I(U;W)-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}\frac{(c-1)^2}{c'}}. \tag{84}$$

Our next step is to choose c and c' to get a doubly-exponentially decaying function on the RHS of (84). Let

$$c' = 2^{n\left(I(V;W|U)-R_2-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}+\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+2\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+\frac{\delta_2}{2}\right)}-1, \tag{85}$$

and note that the exponent is strictly positive since

$$\begin{aligned} I(V;W|U)-R_2-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}+\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+2\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+\frac{\delta_2}{2} &\overset{(a)}{=} R_1-I(U;W)-\frac{\delta_2}{2}-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1} \\ &= \frac{2(\alpha-1)\Big[R_1-d_\alpha(Q_{U,W},Q_UQ_W)-\delta_1\Big]+\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}(2\delta_1-\delta_2)}{2\alpha-1} \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is because $\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+2\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}=R_1+R_2-I(U,V;W)-\delta_2$ and the positivity is by the choice of α from Lemma 5 and since $\delta_2<2\delta_1$. Consequently, $c'\to\infty$ as $n\to\infty$, and therefore, $c'\ge 2^{-n\left(I(U;W)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}$ for sufficiently large n. Since c' is unbounded (as a function of n), for n large enough we also have $\ln c'-1\ge 1$, which simplifies the RHS of (84) as

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\left(R_2-I(V;W|U)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}-\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right)}\left(c'(\ln c'-1)+1\right)} &\le 2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\left(R_2-I(V;W|U)+\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}-\epsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right)}(c'+1)} \\ &= 2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\left(2\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+\frac{\delta_2}{2}\right)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

which shrinks doubly-exponentially quickly to 0.

Setting $c=1+2^{-n\frac{\delta_1}{4}}$, we upper bound the second term from the RHS of (84) by

$$e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-I(U;W)-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}\frac{(c-1)^2}{c'}} \le e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-I(U;W)-\epsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}\frac{(c-1)^2}{(c'+1)}} = e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\frac{\delta_2-\delta_1}{2}}}, \tag{87}$$

which also converges to 0 with double-exponential speed because $\delta_1<\delta_2$.

Concluding, (84), (87) and (87) upper bound the probability of interest as

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w})\ge 1+2^{-n\frac{\delta_1}{4}}\Big) \le 2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\left(2\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+\frac{\delta_2}{2}\right)}} + e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\frac{\delta_2-\delta_1}{2}}}. \tag{88}$$

At this point, we specialize to $\mathcal{W}$ being a finite set. Consequently, $\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,2}$ is bounded as

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,2}(\mathbf{w}) \le \left(\max_{w\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_W)}\frac{1}{Q_W(w)}\right)^n,\ \forall\,\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n, \tag{89}$$

with probability 1. Notice that the maximum is only over the support of Q_W, which makes this bound finite. The

underlying reason for this restriction is that with probability one a conditional distribution is absolutely continuous with respect to any of its associated marginal distributions.

Having (75), (88) and (89), we can now bound the probability that the RHS of (60) is not exponentially small. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of superposition codebooks $\mathcal{B}_n$, such that all of the following are true:

$$\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2} < 2\cdot\left(2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}}+2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right), \tag{90a}$$

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w}) < 1+2^{-n\frac{\delta_1}{4}}, \quad \forall \mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n, \tag{90b}$$

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}(\mathbf{v}) \le \left(\max_{w\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_W)}\frac{1}{Q_W(w)}\right)^n, \quad \forall \mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n. \tag{90c}$$

First, we use the union bound, while taking advantage of the fact that the space $\mathcal{W}^n$ is only exponentially large, to show that the probability of a random codebook not being in $\mathcal{S}$ is double-exponentially small:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{B}_n\notin\mathcal{S}\big) &\overset{(a)}{\le} \mathbb{P}\left(\int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,2}\ge 2\cdot 2^{-n\beta_{\alpha,\delta}}\right)+\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n}\mathbb{P}\left(\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1}(\mathbf{w})\ge 1+2^{-\beta_{\alpha,\delta}n}\right)\\ &\qquad+\sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{W}^n}\mathbb{P}\left(\Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,2}(\mathbf{w})>\left(\max_{w\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_W)}\frac{1}{Q_W(w)}\right)^n\right)\\ &\overset{(b)}{\le} 2^{nR_2}\cdot e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\left(R_1-\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}\right)}}+|\mathcal{W}|^n\left[2^{nR_1}e^{-2^{n\left(2\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}+\frac{\delta_2}{2}\right)}}+e^{-\frac{1}{3}2^{n\frac{\delta_2-\delta_1}{2}}}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where (a) is the union bound, (b) uses (75), (88) and (89).

Next, we claim that for every codebook in $\mathcal{S}$, the RHS of (60) is exponentially small. Let $\mathcal{B}_n\in\mathcal{S}$ and consider the following. For every $x\in[0,1]$, $h(x)\le x\log\frac{e}{x}$, using which (90a) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}h\left(\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\right) &= h\left(\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\right)\\ &< 2\left[\log e-\log 2\cdot\log\left(2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}}+2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right)\right]\left(2^{-n\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1}}+2^{-n\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}}\right)\\ &\overset{(a)}{\le} 4\big(\log e+2\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}\log 2\big)n2^{-n\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}},\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where (a) follows by setting $\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}\triangleq\min\left\{\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha,\delta_1},\beta^{(2)}_{\alpha,\delta_2}\right\}$. Furthermore, by (90b), we have

$$\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\log\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,1} < \int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\log\left(1+2^{-n\frac{\delta_1}{4}}\right)=\log\left(1+2^{-n\frac{\delta_1}{4}}\right)\overset{(a)}{\le}2^{-n\frac{\delta_1}{4}}\log e, \tag{93}$$

where (a) is since $\log(1+x)\le x\log e$, for every $x>0$. Finally, using (90c) and the definition of $\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}$, we obtain

$$\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\log\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\le\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\log\left(\max_{w\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_W)}\frac{1}{Q_W(w)}\right)^n<2\log\left(\max_{w\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_W)}\frac{1}{Q_W(w)}\right)n2^{-n\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}}. \tag{94}$$

Combining (92)-(94) while setting $\gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}\triangleq\min\left\{\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2},\frac{\delta_1}{4}\right\}$, yields

$$h\left(\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\right)+\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}\log\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,1}+\int dP_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}\log\Delta_{\mathcal{B}_n,2}$$

$$< \left(4\big(\log e + 2\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2} \log 2 \big) + \log e + 2 \log \left(\max_{w \in \mathrm{supp}(Q_W)} \frac{1}{Q_W(w)} \right) \right) n 2^{-n\gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}}$$
$$\overset{(a)}{=} c_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2} n 2^{-n\gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}} \tag{95}$$

where (a) comes from setting

$$c_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2} \triangleq 4\big(\log e + 2\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2} \log 2 \big) + \log e + 2 \log \left(\max_{w \in \mathrm{supp}(Q_W)} \frac{1}{Q_W(w)} \right). \tag{96}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} \Big\| Q_W^n \Big) \geq c_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2} n 2^{-n\gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}} \right) \\
&\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}\left(h\left(\int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,1} \right) + \int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,1} \log \Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,1} + \int dP_{\mathbb{B}_n,2} \log \Delta_{\mathbb{B}_n,2} \geq c_{\alpha,\delta} n 2^{-n\beta_{\alpha,\delta}} \right) \\
&\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}\big(\mathbb{B}_n \notin \mathcal{S} \big) \\
&\qquad \overset{(a)}{\leq} 2^{nR_2} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{3} 2^{n\left(R_1 - \beta_{\alpha,\delta_1}^{(1)} \right)}} + |\mathcal{W}|^n \left[2^{nR_1} e^{-2^{n\left(2\beta_{\alpha,\delta_2}^{(2)} + \frac{\delta_2}{2} \right)}} + e^{-\frac{1}{3} 2^{n\frac{\delta_2 - \delta_1}{2}}} \right] \\
&\qquad \overset{(b)}{\leq} 2^{nR_2} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{3} 2^{n\delta_1}} + |\mathcal{W}|^n \left[2^{nR_1} e^{-2^{n\frac{\delta_2}{2}}} + e^{-\frac{1}{3} 2^{n\frac{\delta_2 - \delta_1}{2}}} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

where (a) follows from (91), while (b) is because $\beta_{\alpha,\delta_1}^{(1)} \leq \frac{1}{2}(R_1 - \delta_1)$ and $\beta_{\alpha,\delta_2}^{(2)} \geq 0$. Denoting $c_{\delta_1,\delta_2} \triangleq \sup_{\alpha>1} c_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}$, (97) further gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} \Big\| Q_W^n \Big) \geq c_{\delta_1,\delta_2} n 2^{-n\gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}} \right) \leq 2^{nR_2} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{3} 2^{n\delta_1}} + |\mathcal{W}|^n \left[2^{nR_1} e^{-2^{n\frac{\delta_2}{2}}} + e^{-\frac{1}{3} 2^{n\frac{\delta_2 - \delta_1}{2}}} \right]. \tag{98}$$

Since (98) holds for all $\alpha > 1$ (the interesting values of α are those from Lemma 5, but the derivation is valid for all $\alpha > 1$), it must also be true, with strict inequality in the LHS, when replacing $\gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}$ with $\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2} \triangleq \sup_{\alpha>1} \gamma_{\alpha,\delta_1,\delta_2}$, which is the exponential rate of convergence stated in (14a) that we derive for the strong SCL. This establishes the statement from (13) and proves Lemma 1.

Concluding, if $R_1 > I(U;W)$, $R_1 + R_2 > I(U,V;W)$, then for any $\delta_1 \in \big(0, R_1 - I(U;W)\big)$ and $\delta_2 \in \big(0, R_1 + R_2 - I(U,V;W)\big)$ with $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < 2\delta_1$, we get exponential convergence of the relative entropy at rate $O(2^{-n\gamma_{\delta_1,\delta_2}})$ with doubly-exponential certainty. Discarding the precise exponents of convergence and coefficients, we state that there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$, such that for n large enough

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D\Big(P_{\mathbf{W}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} \Big\| Q_W^n \Big) > e^{-n\gamma_1} \right) \leq e^{-e^{n\gamma_2}}. \tag{99}$$

B. Proof of Theorem 1

Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and a conditional PMF $Q_{U,V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $M \sim P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$, be the message distribution. We first show that for any $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ with $R < R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$, there exists a semantically-secure sequence of (n,R)-codes with a vanishing *average* error probability, i.e., when $M \sim P_M^{(U)}$ - the uniform distribution over $\mathcal{M}_n$. Afterwards, the uniform message distribution assumption for the error probability analysis

is dropped using the expurgation technique [17, Theorem 7.7.1], which allows upgrading reliability to achieve a vanishing *maximal* error probability, while preserving SS.

Codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$: We use a superposition codebook similar to the one described in Section III, with the main difference being that here the outer layer also encodes the confidential message. The codebook is constructed independently of the state sequence $\mathbf{S}$, but with sufficient redundancy to correlate the transmission with $\mathbf{S}$.

Let I and J be two independent random variables uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{I}_n \triangleq \big[1 : 2^{nR_1}\big]$ and $\mathcal{J}_n \triangleq \big[1 : 2^{nR_2}\big]$, respectively.[3] Let $\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)} \triangleq \big\{\mathbf{U}(i)\big\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$ be a random inner layer codebook defined as in Section III. Namely, $\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)}$ is a set of random vectors of length n that are i.i.d. according to Q_U^n. A realizations of $\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)} \triangleq \big\{\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\big\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}\right) = \prod_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} Q_U^n\big(\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\big). \tag{100}$$

To describe the outer layer codebook, fix $\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}$ and for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$ let $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i) \triangleq \big\{\mathbf{V}(i,j,m)\big\}_{(j,m)\in\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n}$ be a collection of i.i.d. random vectors of length n with distribution $Q_{V|U=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)}^n$. A random outer layer codebook (with respect to an inner codebook $\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}$) is defined as $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)} \triangleq \big\{\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i)\big\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}$. A realization of $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i)$, for $i \in \mathcal{I}_n$, is denoted by $\mathcal{B}_V^{(n)} \triangleq \big\{\mathbf{v}(i,j,\mathcal{B}_V)\big\}_{(j,m)\in\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n}$. We also use $\mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}$ to denote a realization of $\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}$, for which

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\Big|\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}\Big) &= \prod_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}(i) = \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}(i)\Big|\mathbf{U}(i) = \mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\Big)\\ &= \prod_{i\in\mathcal{I}_n}\left(\prod_{(j,m)\in\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n} Q_{V|U}^n\big(\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V)\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\big)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Finally, a random superposition codebook is given by $\mathbb{B}_n = \Big\{\mathbb{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathbb{B}_V^{(n)}\Big\}$, while $\mathcal{B}_n = \Big\{\mathcal{B}_U^{(n)}, \mathcal{B}_V^{(n)}\Big\}$ denotes a fixed codebook.

The encoder and decoder are described next for a fixed superposition codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$.

Encoder $f_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$: The encoding phase is based on the likelihood-encoder [11], which, in turn, allows us to approximate the (rather cumbersome) induced joint distribution by a much simpler distribution which we use for the analysis.

To send $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ upon observing the state sequence $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{S}^n$, the encoder randomly chooses $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{J}_n$ according to

$$P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,j|m,\mathbf{s}) = \frac{Q_{S|U,V}^n\big(\mathbf{s}\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V)\big)}{\sum_{(i',j')\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} Q_{S|U,V}^n\big(\mathbf{s}\big|\mathbf{u}(i',\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i',j',m,\mathcal{B}_V)\big)}, \tag{102}$$

where $Q_{S|U,V}$ is the conditional marginal of $Q_{S,U,V}$ defined by $Q_{S,U,V}(s,u,v) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} W_S(s) Q_{U,V,X|S}(u,v,x|s)$, for every $(s,u,v) \in \mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{V}$. The channel input sequence is then generated by feeding the chosen u- and v-codewords along with the state sequence into a DMC $Q_{X|U,V,S}$, i.e., it is sampled from the random vector $\mathbf{X} \sim Q_{X|U=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),V=\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V),S=\mathbf{s}}^n$.

[3] Again, for simplicity of notation we assume that 2^{nR}, 2^{nR_1} and 2^{nR_2} are all integers.

Accordingly, the (stochastic) encoding function $f_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} : \mathcal{M}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ is given by

$$f_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{x}|m,\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,j|m,\mathbf{s}) Q_{X|U,V,S}^n\big(\mathbf{x}\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V),\mathbf{s}\big),\ \forall (m,\mathbf{s},\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{S}^n\times\mathcal{X}^n. \tag{103}$$

Decoder $\boldsymbol{\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}$: We define three decoding functions:

1) $\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} : \mathcal{Y}^n \to \hat{\mathcal{M}}_n$, which is the actual decoder of the message m.
2) $\psi_{n,I}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} : \mathcal{Y}^n \to \hat{\mathcal{I}}_n$, where $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_n \triangleq \mathcal{I}_n \cup \{e\}$.
3) $\psi_{n,J}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} : \mathcal{Y}^n \to \hat{\mathcal{J}}_n$, where $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_n \triangleq \mathcal{J}_n \cup \{e\}$.

Here e is the same error symbol from the definition of $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_n$ for which we assume $e \notin \mathcal{M}_n \cup \mathcal{I}_n \cup \mathcal{J}_n$. The functions $\psi_{n,I}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ and $\psi_{n,J}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ are subsequently used for the reliability analysis.

Upon observing $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$, the decoder searches for a unique triple $(\hat{i},\hat{j},\hat{m}) \in \mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{J}_n \times \mathcal{M}_n$ such that

$$\Big(\mathbf{u}(\hat{i},\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(\hat{i},\hat{j},\hat{m},\mathcal{B}_V),\mathbf{y}\Big) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_{U,V,Y}). \tag{104}$$

If such a unique triple is found, then set $\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{m}$, $\psi_{n,I}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{i}$ and $\psi_{n,J}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{j}$; otherwise, $\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y}) = \psi_{n,I}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y}) = \psi_{n,J}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y}) = e$.

The triple $(\mathcal{M}_n, f_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}, \phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)})$ defined with respect to the codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$ constitutes an (n,R)-code c_n. When a random codebook $\mathbb{B}_n$ is used, we denote the corresponding random code by $\mathbb{C}_n$. The joint distribution $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ over $\mathcal{M}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{J}_n \times \mathcal{U}^n \times \mathcal{V}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \hat{\mathcal{M}}_n$ induced by a fixed $\mathcal{B}_n$ is

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{s},m,i,j,\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\hat{m}) = P_M(m) W_S^n(\mathbf{s}) P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,j|m,\mathbf{s}) \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\right\}\cap\left\{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V)\right\}} \\ \times Q_{X|U,V,S}^n(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{s}) W_{Y,Z|X,S}^n(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s}) \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y})=\hat{m}\right\}}, \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

where $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,j|m,\mathbf{s})$ is given in (102). If $P_M = P_M^{(U)}$, i.e., the message distribution is uniform, we write $\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ instead of $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$.

Approximating Distribution: Our next step is to show that $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ is close in total variation to a new (and simpler) distribution $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, which we use for the reliability and security analyses. For any $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$, we define $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(m,i,j,\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{s},\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\hat{m}) = P_M(m) 2^{-n(R_1+R_2)} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)\right\}\cap\left\{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V)\right\}} Q_{S|U,V}^n(\mathbf{s}|\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}) \\ \times Q_{X|U,V,S}^n(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{s}) W_{Y,Z|X,S}^n(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\mathbf{s}) \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y})=\hat{m}\right\}}, \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

As before, when $P_M = P_M^{(U)}$, the notation $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ replaces $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$. The following lemma states sufficient conditions for the total variation between $\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}$ and $P^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}$ to converge exponentially fast to zero with double-exponential certainty (with respect to a random superposition codebook $\mathbb{B}_n$).

Lemma 7 (Sufficient Conditions for Approximation) *If*

$$R_1 > I(U;S) \tag{107a}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 > I(U,V;S), \tag{107b}$$

then there exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$, such that for any n large enough

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} \left|\left| P^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\alpha_1} \right) \leq e^{-e^{n\alpha_2}}. \tag{108}$$

In particular, for any such n it also holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\left| \bar{P}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq e^{-n\alpha_1} + n \log\left(\frac{1}{\mu_S}\right) e^{-e^{n\alpha_2}}, \tag{109}$$

where $\mu_S = \min_{s \in \mathrm{supp}(W_S)} W_S(s) > 0$.

The proof of Lemma 7 relies on the strong SCL for superposition codes and some basic properties of total variation. See Appendix H for details. Lemma 7 is key in analysing the performance of the proposed code. For the reliability part, on which we focus next, we overlook the stronger claim from (108) and use the convergence of the expected value stated in (109) to show that the average error probability can be made arbitrarily small. The expurgation method [17, Theorem 7.7.1] is then used to upgrade to a vanishing maximal error probability.

Average Error Probability Analysis: We first establish reliability when $P_M = P_M^{(U)}$. The main idea here is to use Lemma 7 to move away from analysing the error probability under $\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ to an analysis with respect to $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$. As shown subsequently, analysing the latter involves only standard and simple typicality arguments.

A code c_n (with respect to a fixed superposition codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$) and a uniformly distributed message induce the joint distribution $\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ (see (105)). The average error probability $e_a(c_n)$ associated with c_n can be expressed as

$$e_a(c_n) = 2^{-nR} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} e_m(c_n) = \mathbb{P}_{\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M} \neq M\big), \tag{110}$$

where the subscript $\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ on RHS indicates that the probability measure is induced by the PMF $\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$.

We first show that a sufficient condition for the RHS of (110) to become arbitrarily small is that the average error probability induced by the $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ PMF, i.e., $\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M} \neq M\big)$, is small. Recall the following property of total variation (see, e.g., [11, Property (b)]): Let μ, ν be two measures on a measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ and $g : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative measurable function bounded by $b \in \mathbb{R}$. It holds that

$$\big|\mathbb{E}_\mu g - \mathbb{E}_\nu g\big| \leq b \cdot \big|\big|\mu - \nu\big|\big|_{TV} \tag{111}$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $g_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} : \mathcal{M}_n \times \hat{\mathcal{M}}_n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$g_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(m, \hat{m}) = \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\hat{m} \neq m\right\}}, \quad \forall (m, \hat{m}) \in \mathcal{M}_n \times \hat{\mathcal{M}}_n, \tag{112}$$

and note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}} g_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(M,\hat{M}) = \mathbb{P}_{\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big), \tag{113a}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}} g_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(M,\hat{M}) = \mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big). \tag{113b}$$

The property from (111) gives that for any $\mathcal{B}_n$

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\mathbb{P}_{\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) - \mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big)\Big| &\leq \Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\hat{M}} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\hat{M}}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}},\end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

where (a) follows because for any $P_{X,Y}, Q_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})$ with marginals P_X and Q_X, respectively, it holds that $\big|\big|P_X - Q_X\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \big|\big|P_{X,Y} - Q_{X,Y}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}$. We use the shorthand $\Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}$ for the total variation from the RHS of (114) and rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) - \Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) + \Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}.\end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

Taking an expectation over the ensemble of superposition codebooks, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{P}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}.\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

Lemma 7 states that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\Big|\Big|\bar{P}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} - \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|$ can be made arbitrarily small with n provided that (107) are satisfied. To show that the expected average error probability under $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}$ also converges to 0 with n consider the following. For every codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$ and $(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n$, define the event

$$\mathcal{E}(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m},\mathcal{B}_n) = \Big\{\big(\mathbf{u}(\tilde{i},\mathcal{B}_U), \mathbf{v}(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m},\mathcal{B}_V), \mathbf{Y}\big) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_{U,V,Y})\Big\}, \tag{117}$$

where $\mathbf{Y} \sim Q^n_{Y|U=\mathbf{u}(\tilde{i},\mathcal{B}_U)V=\mathbf{v}(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m},\mathcal{B}_V)}$ is the random sequence observed at the receiver when the transmitter sends $(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m})$ over the effective DMC $Q^n_{Y|U,V}$ defined by

$$Q_{Y|U,V}(y|u,v) = \sum_{(s,x,z)\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Z}} Q_{S|U,V}(s|u,v)Q_{X|S,U,V}(x|s,u,v)W_{Y,Z|X,S}(y,z|x,s), \quad \forall (u,v,y)\in\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{Y}. \tag{118}$$

Furthermore, the PMF $Q_{U,V,Y}$ with respect to which the letter-typical set on the RHS of (117) is defined is the marginal of $W_S Q_{U,V,X|S} W_{Y,Z|X,S}$.

To upper bound the expected average error probability under $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}$, for each $\mathcal{B}_n$, we extend $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ to the space $\mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{S}^n\times\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{U}^n\times\mathcal{V}^n\times\mathcal{X}^n\times\mathcal{Y}^n\times\mathcal{Z}^n\times\hat{\mathcal{M}}_n\times\hat{\mathcal{I}}_n\times\hat{\mathcal{J}}_n$ by

$$\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(m,i,j,\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{s},\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\hat{m},\hat{i},\hat{j}) = \bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(m,i,j,\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v},\mathbf{s},\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\hat{m})\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\psi_{n,I}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y})=\hat{i}\right\}\cap\left\{\psi_{n,J}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{y})=\hat{j}\right\}}, \tag{119}$$

thus allowing us to accounts for errors in decoding I and J as well. We have the following upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\big(\hat{M}\neq M\big) &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big((\hat{M},\hat{I},\hat{J})\neq(M,I,J)\Big)\\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big((\hat{M},\hat{I},\hat{J})\neq(1,1,1)\Big|(M,I,J)=(1,1,1)\Big)\\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Bigg(\mathcal{E}(1,1,1,\mathbb{B}_n)^c\cup\Bigg\{\bigcup_{\tilde{i}\neq 1}\mathcal{E}(\tilde{i},1,1,\mathbb{B}_n)\Bigg\}\\
&\qquad\cup\Bigg\{\bigcup_{(\tilde{j},\tilde{m})\neq(1,1)}\mathcal{E}(1,\tilde{j},\tilde{m},\mathbb{B}_n)\Bigg\}\cup\Bigg\{\bigcup_{(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m})\neq(1,1,1)}\mathcal{E}(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m},\mathbb{B}_n)\Bigg\}\Bigg)\\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} \underbrace{\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V,Y}}\Big((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{Y})\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_{U,V,Y})\Big)}_{P_1}+\underbrace{\sum_{\tilde{i}\neq 1}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V}\times Q^n_Y}\Big((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{Y})\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_{U,V,Y})\Big)}_{P_2}\\
&\qquad+\underbrace{\sum_{(\tilde{j},\tilde{m})\neq(1,1)}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V}\times Q^n_{Y|U}}\Big((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{Y})\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_{U,V,Y})\Big)}_{P_3}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\underbrace{\sum_{(\tilde{i},\tilde{j},\tilde{m})\neq(1,1,1)}\mathbb{P}_{Q^n_{U,V}\times Q^n_Y}\Big((\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{Y})\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_{U,V,Y})\Big)}_{P_4}
\end{aligned}$$

where:

(a) is because the probability of error in decoding M is upper bounded by the probability of error in decoding (I,J,M);

(b) follows by the symmetry of the code under $\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ with respect to (i,j,m);

(c) is definition of the decoding rules $\phi_n^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, $\psi_{n,I}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ and $\psi_{n,J}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$;

(d) uses the union bound and takes the expectation over the ensemble of codebooks.

By the law of large numbers $P_1\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, while P_2, P_3 and P_4 all converge to 0 as n grows provided that

$$R+R_2<I(V;Y|U), \tag{120a}$$

$$R+R_1+R_2<I(U,V;Y). \tag{120b}$$

Specifically, (120a) implies that $P_3\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$, while (120b) ensures that both $P_2\to 0$ and $P_4\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. This is since a sufficient condition for the former is in fact

$$R_1<I(U,V;Y). \tag{121}$$

However, (121) is clearly redundant having (120b). Concluding, as long as (107) and (120) are simultaneously

satisfied, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n} e_a(\mathbb{C}_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0. \tag{122}$$

Security Analysis: The security analysis is based on the approximation of $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ using $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, for any $P_m \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$. We first show that if SS is achieved under $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, then it is also achieved under $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$. Having that, it remain to be shown that SS is attainable under $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$; this is established by relying on the heterogeneous version of the strong SCL from [15, Lemma 1]. The underlying idea behind the rate bound we derive for SS is to allow the eavesdropper to decode the inner layer codeword, thus making him waste channel resources on decoding a codeword that carries no confidential information. The remaining resources are insufficient for extracting any information on the outer layer codeword, which, in turn, results in our code being semantically-secure.

To justify that achieving SS under $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ is sufficient for achieving it under $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 8 (SS for Induced vs. Approximating Distribution) *Let $\mathcal{B}_n$ be a superposition codebook for which there exists a $\beta_1 > 0$, such that for all $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ and sufficiently large values of n*

$$\left|\left| P_M P_{\mathbf{Z}|M}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - P_M \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}|M}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq e^{-n\beta_1}. \tag{123}$$

Then, there exists a $\beta_2 > 0$, such that for all $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ and n large enough (possibly larger then the values of n needed for (123) *to become valid)*

$$\left| I_P(M;\mathbf{Z}) - I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}) \right| \leq e^{-n\beta_2}, \tag{124}$$

where the subscripts P and Γ indicate that a mutual information term is calculated with respect to $P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$ or $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$, respectively.

The proof of Lemma 8 is relegated to Appendix I. As subsequently shown, the existence of a codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$ that satisfies (123) essentially follows by Lemma 7. For such a $\mathcal{B}_n$, we have that for any $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$

$$I_P(M;\mathbf{Z}) \leq I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}) + e^{-n\beta_2}, \tag{125}$$

for n sufficiently large. In particular, (125) also holds for $P_M^\star$, the maximizer of $I_P(M;\mathbf{Z})$ (that exists due to concavity). Further increasing the RHS by maximizing it over all $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ as well, gives

$$\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n) = \max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} I_P(M;\mathbf{Z}) \leq \max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}) + e^{-n\beta_2}, \tag{126}$$

where c_n is the code associated with $\mathcal{B}_n$. Thus, finding a codebook for which the RHS of (126) can be made arbitrarily small implies SS.

With that in mind, we now focus on the maximized mutual information term from the RHS of (126). For any

$\mathcal{B}_n$ and $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}) &\le I_\Gamma(M;I,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{Z}) \\ &= I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}|I,\mathbf{U}) \\ &= D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{Z}|I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) \\ &\overset{(b)}{\le} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

where (a) is by the relative entropy chain rule and because $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M|I,\mathbf{U}} = P_M$, while (b) follows because

$$D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) = D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) - D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) \tag{128}$$

and due to the non-negativity or relative entropy. Although, the inequality from (127) is true for any $Q_{Z|U} : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$, by $Q_{Z|U}$ we refer to the conditional marginal of the joint single-letter distribution $W_S Q_{U,V,X|S} W_{Y,Z|X,S}$. Maximizing (127) over all message distributions, we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{P_M\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}) &\le \max_{P_M\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) \\ &= \max_{P_M\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} P_M(m) D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) \\ &\le \max_{P_M\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} P_M(m) \max_{\tilde{m}\in\mathcal{M}} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=\tilde{m},I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|P_M\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big) \\ &= \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}}\Big|\Big|Q^n_{Z|U}\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

As stated next, a sufficient condition for the RHS of (129) to converge to zero with the blocklength is that a corresponding total variation produces an exponential decay. This is an extension of the property mentioned in [23, Remark 1].

Lemma 9 (Total Variation Dominates Relative Entropy) *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be finite sets, and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $P_{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$, $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}} : \mathcal{X}^n \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}^n)$ and $Q_{Y|X} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$. If $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} \ll Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$, i.e., $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}$ is absolutely contineous with respect to $Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}$, then*

$$D\big(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}\big|\big|Q^n_{Y|X}\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}\big) \le \big|\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}} - P_{\mathbf{X}}Q^n_{Y|X}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \left(n\log|\mathcal{Y}| + \log\frac{1}{\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}} - P_{\mathbf{X}}Q^n_{Y|X}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}} + n\log\mu_{Y|X}\right), \tag{130}$$

where $\mu_{Y|X} = \min_{\substack{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}:\\ Q_{Y|X}(y|x)>0}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$.

See Appendix J for the proof of Lemma 9. It is easily verified that $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} \ll Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}$, for each $(i,m,\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{M}_n \times \mathcal{U}^n$, and therefore, the lemma implies that to get the RHS of (129) to converge to 0 with

n, it suffices to show that

$$\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}Q^n_{Z|U}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \tag{131}$$

exponentially fast for every $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$. To do so, note that for the $\epsilon > 0$ that was fixed at the beginning of the proof and for any $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}Q^n_{Z|U}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} \\
&\qquad\leq \max_{\substack{i\in\mathcal{I}_n,\\ \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)}} \left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} - Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} + \sum_{\mathbf{u}\notin\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)} \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(\mathbf{u}) \\
&\qquad\leq \max_{\substack{i\in\mathcal{I}_n,\\ \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)}} \left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} - Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} + \mathbb{P}_{\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(I,\mathcal{B}_n)\notin\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

where $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}$ is well defined if $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_n)$, and otherwise we set $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} = Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}$.

Let $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$ be arbitrary (to be chosen later) and consider:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n}\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}Q^n_{Z|U}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > 4e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n}\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}}Q^n_{Z|U}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > 4e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right) \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n}\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\substack{i\in\mathcal{I}_n,\\ \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)}}\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} - Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} + \mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(I,\mathbb{B}_n)\notin\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)\Big) > 4e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right) \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n}\Bigg[\sum_{\substack{i\in\mathcal{I}_n\\ \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)}} \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\Big|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}}_{P} \\
&\qquad + \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbb{P}_{\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(I,\mathbb{B}_n}
\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

where (a) and (c) are the union bound, while (b) uses (132).

For each $(i,m,\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{I}_n \times \mathcal{M}_n \times \mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)$, we treat $P_1(i,m,\mathbf{u})$ by means of the heterogeneous strong SCL from [15, Lemma 1]. To show that $P_1(i,m,\mathbf{u})$ matches the framework of Lemma 1 from [15] consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1(i,m,\mathbf{u}) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} - Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right\}\cap\Big\{\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big\}\right) \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} - Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right\}\cap\Big\{\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)\neq\mathbf{u}\Big\}\right) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}} - Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right\}\cap\Big\{\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big\}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

where (a) is because when $\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)\neq\mathbf{u}$, by definition, $\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}=Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}$, and hence the total variation is 0, which nullifies the second probability term.

Now, recall that for any $(i,m)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n$, $\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_V(i)=\big\{\mathbf{V}(i,j,m)\big\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n}$ is a collection of $|\mathcal{J}_n|=2^{-nR_2}$ i.i.d. random vectors, each distributed according to $Q^n_{V|U=\mathbf{u}}$. For each realization $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_V(i)$ of $\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_V(i)$ and every $(i,m,\mathbf{u})\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)$, define the PMF

$$\Lambda^{\left(\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_V(i),m\right)}(j,\mathbf{v},\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{u})=2^{-nR_2}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}\left(j,m,\mathcal{B}_V(i)\right)\right\}}Q^n_{Z|U,V}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}),\tag{135}$$

where $\mathbf{v}\big(j,m,\mathcal{B}_V(i)\big)$ stands for $\mathbf{v}\big(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V\big)$ and is used to emphasize the dependence of $\Lambda^{\left(\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_V(i),m\right)}$ on the sub-outer-layer-codebook $\mathcal{B}_V(i)$ only. Based on (135), note the equivalence

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{\left|\left|\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I=i,\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}-Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}}>e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right\}\cap\Big\{\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big\}&\\ =\left\{\left|\left|\Lambda^{\left(\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_V(i),m\right)}_{\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}-Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}}>e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right\}\cap\Big\{\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big\},&\end{aligned}\tag{136}$$

which, by inserting it into (134), implies

$$\begin{aligned}P_1(i,m,\mathbf{u})&\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left|\left|\Lambda^{\left(\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_V(i),m\right)}_{\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}-Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}}>e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right\}\cap\Big\{\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\Big\}\right)\\&\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left|\Lambda^{\left(\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_V(i),m\right)}_{\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}-Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}}>e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\right),\quad\forall(i,m,\mathbf{u})\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U).\end{aligned}\tag{137}$$

The RHS of (137) corresponds to the exact setting of the heterogeneous SCL, where $\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}$ plays the role of the state sequence, $\big\{\mathbf{V}(i,j,m)\big\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}_n}$ is the point-to-point codebook drawn conditioned on $\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}$, and $Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}$ is conditional marginal of the state-dependent DMC $Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u},V}$. Thus, by [15, Lemma 1], if

$$R_2>I_{\nu_\mathbf{u}}(V;Z|U)+\zeta,\tag{138}$$

where $\zeta>0$ is an arbitrarily small positive number and the subscript $\nu_\mathbf{u}$ indicates that the mutual information term is calculated with respect to the empirical PMF of $\mathbf{u}$, i.e., according to $\nu_\mathbf{u}Q_{V|U}Q_{Z|U,V}$, then there exist $\delta_1,\delta_2>0$ uniformly in $(i,m,\mathbf{u})\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left|\Lambda^{\left(\mathbb{B}^{(n)}_V(i),m\right)}_{\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{u}}-Q^n_{Z|U=\mathbf{u}}\right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}}>e^{-n\delta_1}\right)\leq e^{-e^{n\delta_2}},\tag{139}$$

for sufficiently large n. Consequently, taking

$$R_2>\max_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)}I_{\nu_\mathbf{u}}(V;Z|U)+\zeta,\tag{140}$$

and $\tilde{\gamma}\leq\delta_1$, we have that for every $m\in\mathcal{M}_n$ and n large enough

$$\sum_{\substack{i\in\mathcal{I}_n,\\ \mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)}}P_1(i,m,\mathbf{u})\leq 2^{nR_1}\cdot\left|\mathcal{T}^n_\epsilon(Q_U)\right|\cdot e^{-e^{n\delta_2}},\tag{141}$$

which decays to 0 as $n \to \infty$ with double-exponential speed.

For P_2, we use the Chernoff bound from (70b) in Lemma 6 by noticing that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(I,\mathbb{B}_n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)\Big) = 2^{-nR_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} \mathbb{P}_{\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(i,\mathbb{B}_n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)\Big| I = i\Big) \tag{142}$$

is an average of exponentially many i.i.d. random variables bounded in $[0,1]$ with expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n}\mathbb{P}_{\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(I,\mathbb{B}_n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)\Big) = \mathbb{P}_{Q_U^n}\Big(\mathbf{U} \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)\Big) \le e^{-n\eta(\epsilon)}, \tag{143}$$

for some $\eta(\epsilon) > 0$ with $\lim\limits_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \eta(\epsilon) = 0$ (see, e.g., [24, Lemma 5] for the exact exponent of decay). Thus, by the Chernoff bound with $M = 2^{nR_1}$, $\mu = e^{-n\eta(\epsilon)}$, $B = 1$, and $\frac{c}{\mu} = 2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}}\Big(\mathbf{U}(I,\mathbb{B}_n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)\Big) > 2e^{-n\eta(\epsilon)}\right) \le e^{\frac{2^{nR_1}e^{-n\eta(\epsilon)}}{3}} = e^{-\frac{1}{3}e^{n\left(R_1 \ln 2 - \eta(\epsilon)\right)}}, \tag{144}$$

which converges to zero doubly-exponentially fast as $n \to \infty$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ with

$$R_1 > \frac{\eta(\epsilon)}{\ln 2}. \tag{145}$$

Thus, for any $\tilde{\gamma} \le \eta(\epsilon)$, we have

$$P_2 \le e^{-\frac{1}{3}\left(R_1 \ln 2 - \eta(\epsilon)\right)}. \tag{146}$$

Thus, as long as (140) and (145) are valid and $0 < \tilde{\gamma} = \min\big\{\delta_1, \eta(\epsilon)\big\}$, we may plug (141) and (146) back into (133) while using the bound $\big|\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)\big| \le 2^{H_Q(U)(1+\epsilon)}$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\max_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \Big|\Big|\Gamma_{I,\mathbf{U}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}\Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{I,\mathbf{U}}^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}Q_{Z|U}^n\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} > 4e^{-n\tilde{\gamma}}\Bigg) \\ \le 2^{nR}\left[2^{n\left(R_1 + H_Q(U)(1+\epsilon)\right)} \cdot e^{-e^{n\delta_2}} + e^{-\frac{1}{3}e^{n\left(R_1 \ln 2 - \eta(\epsilon)\right)}}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{147}$$

for all sufficiently large values of n.

We next replace the rate bound on R_2 from (140) with a bound bound that involves only the single-letter PMF $Q_U Q_{V|U} Q_{Z|U,V}$ (rather the the empirical PMF of each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U)$ in the role of Q_U). By the continuity of mutual information, there exists a positive real-valued function $\theta(\epsilon)$ with $\lim\limits_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \theta(\epsilon) = 0$, such that

$$\Big|I_Q(V;Z|U) - I_{\nu_{\mathbf{u}}}(V;Z|U)\Big| \le \theta(\epsilon), \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n(Q_U), \tag{148}$$

where I_Q indicates that the mutual information term is calculated with respect to $Q_U Q_{V|U} Q_{Z|U,V}$. Accordingly, if

$$R_2 > I_Q(V;Z|U) + \zeta + \theta(\epsilon), \tag{149}$$

then (140) is satisfied. Now, recall that $R_1 > I_Q(U;S)$ (see (107a)) and that $\lim\limits_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \eta(\epsilon) = 0$. Therefore, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ sufficiently small for which $R_1 > \frac{\eta(\epsilon_1)}{\ln 2}$.

To conclude, if (107a) and (149) are satisfied, then (147) holds for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1]$. Overlooking the exact exponents of convergence while noting that $\epsilon > 0$ and $\zeta > 0$ may be chosen arbitrarily small, we see that the rate bounds (107a) and

$$R_2 > I(V; Z|U) \tag{150}$$

ensure the existence of some $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$ and $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all n sufficiently large

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left|\left| \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} Q^n_{Z|U} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\gamma_1} \right) \leq e^{-e^{n\gamma_2}}. \tag{151}$$

Code Extraction: Summarizing the results up to this point, we have that as long as (107), (120) and (151) are simultaneously satisfied, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{B}_n} e_a(\mathbb{C}_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0$ and for sufficiently large n

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} \left|\left| P^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\alpha_1} \right) \leq e^{-e^{n\alpha_2}}, \tag{152a}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left|\left| \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} Q^n_{Z|U} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\gamma_1} \right) \leq e^{-e^{n\gamma_2}}, \tag{152b}$$

are true as well.

The Selection Lemma from [14, Lemma 5], implies the existence of a sequence of realizations $\{\mathcal{B}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of superposition codebooks (giving rise to a sequence of (n, R)-codes $\{c_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$), for which

$$e_a(c_n) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0, \tag{153a}$$

$$\mathbb{1}\left\{ \left|\left| P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\alpha_1} \right\} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0, \tag{153b}$$

$$\mathbb{1}\left\{ \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left|\left| \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} Q^n_{Z|U} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\gamma_1} \right\} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0. \tag{153c}$$

Since the indicator functions in (153b)-(153c) take only the values 0 and 1, to satisfy the convergence it must be true that for any n large enough

$$\max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} \left|\left| P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z},\hat{M}} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq e^{-n\alpha_1}, \tag{154a}$$

and

$$\max_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left|\left| \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} Q^n_{Z|U} \right|\right|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq e^{-n\gamma_1}, \tag{154b}$$

for any such n.

Now, by Lemma 9 and (129), the exponential decay of the total variation in (154b) implies that there exists a $\lambda > 0$, such that for all n large enough

$$\max_{P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)} I_\Gamma(M; \mathbf{Z}) \leq \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m,I,\mathbf{U}} \Big|\Big| Q^n_{Z|U} \Big| \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{I,\mathbf{U}} \Big) \leq e^{-n\lambda}, \tag{155}$$

which implies SS under $\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}$. Now, (154a) in particular means that (123) holds for $\beta_1 = \alpha_1$, which by Lemma 8

and (126) implies that

$$\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n) \leq e^{-\lambda n} + e^{-n\beta_2}, \tag{156}$$

for some $\beta_2 > 0$ and sufficiently large n.

Having (153a) and (156), we see that the sequence of (n, R)-codes $\left\{c_n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is reliable with respect to the average error probability and semantically-secure. Our final step is to amend $\left\{c_n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to be reliable with respect to the maximal error probability (as defined in (18a)). This is done using the expurgation technique (see, e.g., [17, Theorem 7.7.1]). Let n be sufficiently large so that

$$e_a(c_n) = 2^{-nR} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n} e_m(c_n) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \tag{157}$$

and remove from the message set all the messages that contribute more than ϵ to the average error probability. In terms of the codebook $\mathcal{B}_n$, if $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ is a message with $e_m(c_n) \geq \epsilon$, we discard the codewords $\left\{\mathbf{v}(i,j,m)\right\}_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n}$. Denoting the amended sequence of codebooks by $\left\{\mathcal{B}_n^\star\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and their corresponding codes by $\left\{c_n^\star\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, we have

$$e(c_n^\star) \leq \epsilon. \tag{158}$$

Note that in each $c_n^\star$ there are 2^{nR-1} codewords, i.e., throwing out half the codewords has changed the rate from R to $R-\frac{1}{n}$, which is negligible for large n. Further note that because $\left\{c_n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is semantically-secure, so is $\left\{c_n^\star\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Finally, applying the Fourier-Motzkin Elimination on (107), (120) and (150), shows that for any $R < R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ the proposed (amended) code achieves $e(c_n^\star) \to 0$ and $\ell_{\mathrm{Sem}}(c_n^\star) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Maximizing over all $Q_{U,V,X|S}$ establishes Theorem 1.

Remark 13 (Alternative SS Analysis) *The SS analysis essentially shows that under the conditions* (107) *and* (150)*, the induced conditional distribution of* $\mathbf{Z}$ *given* $\mathbf{U}$ *and* $M = m$ *approximates a product distribution* $Q_{Z|U}^n$*, uniformly in* $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$*. Since the inner layer codebook (which is encoded by* U*) carries no confidential information, this implies SS. An alternative approach for establishing SS is to make the induced conditional distribution of* $\mathbf{Z}$ *given* $M = m$ *(without* $\mathbf{U}$ *in the conditioning) be a good approximation of* Q_Z^n*, for all* $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$*. This, in effect, implies SS because*

$$\max_{P_M\in\mathcal{M}_n} I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z}) \leq \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}} D\Big(\Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}|M=m}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big\|Q_Z^n\Big). \tag{159}$$

The strong SCL for superposition codebooks once again comes into play here and can be shown to make the RHS of (159) *decay exponentially fast to 0 with double-exponential certainty, provided that*

$$R_1 > I(U;Z) \tag{160a}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 > I(U,V;Z). \tag{160b}$$

Replacing (150) *with* (160) *and combining it with* (107) *and* (120)*, achieves any* R *with*

$$R \leq R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right) \triangleq \min\Big\{I(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;Z), I(V;Y|U), I(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;S)\Big\}. \tag{161}$$

Since one cannot prospectively determine which approach for the SS analysis (if any) is better, the resulting best achievable rates for the SD-WTC would be the maximum between the RHS of (161) *and* $R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ *from* (22)*. However, a close look at the expressions in* $R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ *and in* $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ *reveals that when optimizing over all* $Q_{U,V,X|S}$*,* $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ *is actually redundant. To see this notice that for any* $Q_{U,V,X|S}$*, such that* $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right) \geq R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$*, taking* $P_{\tilde{U},\tilde{V},\tilde{X}|S}$ *with* $\tilde{U} = 0$*,* $\tilde{V} = (U,V)_Q$ *and* $P_{\tilde{X}|S,\tilde{U},\tilde{V}} = Q_{X|S,U,V}$*, where the subscript* Q *in the definition of* $\tilde{V}$ *denotes that the random variables are distributed according to* Q*, gives*

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(P_{\tilde{U},\tilde{V},\tilde{X}|S}\right) = \min\Big\{I_Q(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;Z), I(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;S)\Big\} \geq R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right). \tag{162}$$

This implies that the approach for establishing SS given in the proof of Theorem 1 is superior to the alternative path discussed in this remark. The interpretation of this conclusion is that it is always better to let the eavesdropper decode $\mathbf{U}$*, since this makes it 'waste' channel resources on decoding a layer of the codebook that carries no confidential information. After doing so, the eavesdropper is lacking the required resources to extract any information about* M *(regardless of its distribution) and SS follows.*

VII. Summary and Concluding Remarks

This paper studied SD-WTCs with non-causal encoder CSI. A novel lower bound on the SS-capacity was derived. The coding scheme that achieves the lower bound is based on a superposition codebook, which fully encodes the confidential message in the outer layer. The superposition codebook was constructed with sufficient redundancy to allow correlating the transmission with the observed state sequence. The correlation is performed by means of the likelihood encoder [11]. SS is ensured via distribution approximation arguments and a strong SCL for superposition codes. Via the union bound, the information leakage to the eavesdropper is shown to be negligible for all message distribution. The structure of the rate bounds for secrecy implies that the eavesdropper can decode the inner layer codeword. Since no confidential information is encoded in the inner layer, this doesn't compromise security. The gain from doing so is that decoding the inner layer exhausts the channel resources the eavesdropper posses. Consequently, this prevents him from inferring any information on the outer layer, which contains the confidential message.

Our result was compared to several previous achievability results from the literature. A comparison to the best past achievable scheme for the SD-WTC with non-causal encoder CSI from [6], [7] revealed that our scheme not only captures it as a special case, but that it also strictly outperforms it in some cases. The strict relation was illustrated via an explicit example. When particularizing to the scenario where the decoder also has full CSI, our result was shown to be at least as good as the best known achievability by Chia and El-Gamal [8]. Finally, the SS-capacity of a class of SD-WTC whose channel transition matrix decomposes into product of a WTC that is independent of the state and a WTC that depends only on the state, was characterised. The characterization is under the assumption that the WTC that is independent of S produces a less noisy output to the eavesdropper. It was

also shown that our scheme is tight for the semi-deterministic SD-WTD, where $Y = g(X, S)$ is the deterministic output observed by the legitimate receiver. This SS-capacity result, however, can also be retrieved from [6], [7].

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

As mentioned in Section IV-C, the inequality $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}} \leq R_{\mathrm{A}}$ is straightforward. For the opposite direction consider the following. Let $Q^{\star}_{U,V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$ be such that $R_{\mathrm{A}} = R_{\mathrm{A}}(Q^{\star}_{U,V,X|S}) > 0$, i.e., R_{A} is strictly positive (otherwise there is nothing to prove) and it is achieved by the input distribution $Q^{\star}_{U,V,X|S}$. Recall that the mutual information terms in $R_{\mathrm{A}}(Q^{\star}_{U,V,X,S})$ are taken with respect to $Q^{\star} \triangleq W_S Q^{\star}_{U,V,X,S} W_{Y,Z|X,S}$. First, note that if $Q^{\star}_{U,V,X,S}$ is such that $I(U;Y) - I(U;S) \geq 0$, then $R_{\mathrm{A}} \leq R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}(Q^{\star}_{U,V,X|S}) \leq R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$ and the inequality of interest holds.

The opposite case requires more work. Assume that $Q^{\star}_{U,V,X|S}$ induces $I(U;Y) - I(U;S) < 0$, and let $U' = (U, \tilde{V})$ and $V' = V$, where $\tilde{V}$ is V passed through an erasure channel, with erasures independent of all the other random variables. Denoting the probability of an erasure by $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the joint distribution of $(S, U, V, X, Y, Z, \tilde{V}, U', V')$ is given by

$$Q_{S,U,V,X,Y,Z,\tilde{V},U',V'} = W_S Q^{\star}_{U,V,X|S} W_{Y,Z|X,S} W_{\tilde{V}|V} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{U'=(U,\tilde{V}),V'=V\right\}}, \tag{163}$$

where $W_{\tilde{V}|V} : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V} \cup \{?\}$ for $? \notin \mathcal{V}$, is the transition probability of a BEC(ϵ), and the exact value of ϵ is to be specified later. All subsequent (and preceding) information measures in this proof are taken with respect to the distribution from (163) or its appropriate marginals.

We first show that by a proper choice of $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the conditional marginal distribution $Q_{U',V',X|S}$ is a valid input distribution in $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$, i.e., that it satisfies

$$I(U';Y) - I(U',S) \geq 0. \tag{164}$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} I(U';Y) - I(U';S) &= I(U;Y) - I(U;S) + I(\tilde{V};Y|U) - I(\tilde{V};S|U) \\ &= I(U;Y) - I(U;S) + \bar{\epsilon}\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;S|U)\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{165}$$

where $\bar{\epsilon} = 1 - \epsilon$. Notice that when $\epsilon = 1$ this quantity is negative by assumption, while $\epsilon = 0$ gives

$$I(U';Y) - I(U';S) = I(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;S) > 0 \tag{166}$$

by the second rate bound in R_{A}. We set $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ at the value that produces $I(U';Y) - I(U';S) = 0$, thus satisfying (164).

Being an appropriate input distribution in $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}$, we evaluate $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}(Q_{U',V',X|S})$ next. The simpler rate bound to

start with is the second one, for which we have

$$I(U',V';Y) - I(U',V';S) = I(U,V,\tilde{V};Y) - I(U,V,\tilde{V};S) \stackrel{(a)}{=} I(U,V;Y) - I(U,V;S) \geq R_{\rm A}, \tag{167}$$

where (a) uses the Markov chain $(S,U,X,Y,Z) - V - \tilde{V}$, which follows because $\tilde{V}$ is a noisy version of V.

For the first rate bound, note that

$$\begin{aligned} I(V';Y|U') - I(V';Z|U') &= I(V;Y|U,\tilde{V}) - I(V;Z|U,\tilde{V}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U) - \Big[I(\tilde{V};Y|U) - I(\tilde{V};Z|U)\Big] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U) - \bar{\epsilon}\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U)\Big] \\ &= \epsilon\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U)\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{168}$$

where, as before, (a) and (b) follow by Markovity. A similar derivation also gives

$$I(V';Y|U') - I(V';S|U') = \epsilon\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;S|U)\Big]. \tag{169}$$

We complete the proof by considering two cases. First, if $I(V;S|U) \geq I(V;Z|U)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I(V';Y|U') - I(V';Z|U') &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \epsilon\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U)\Big] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \epsilon\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;S|U)\Big] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} I(V';Y|U') - I(V';S|U') \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} I(U',V';Y') - I(U',V';S) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} R_{\rm A}, \end{aligned} \tag{170}$$

where (a) is (168), (b) follows by the assumption that $I(V;S|U) \geq I(V;Z|U)$, (c) is (169), (d) is by choosing ϵ to satisfy $I(U';Y) - I(U';S) = 0$, while (e) uses (167).

Second, observe that assuming $I(V;S|U) < I(V;Z|U)$ produces:

$$\begin{aligned} I(V';Y|U') - I(V';Z|U') &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \epsilon\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U)\Big] \\ &= I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U) - \bar{\epsilon}\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U)\Big] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{>} I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U) - \bar{\epsilon}\Big[I(V;Y|U) - I(V;S|U)\Big] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} I(V;Y|U) - I(V;Z|U) + I(U;Y) - I(U;S) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} R_{\rm A}, \end{aligned} \tag{171}$$

where (a) is (168) as before, (b) is by the assumption in the second case, (c) uses (165) with $I(U';Y) - I(U';S) = 0$, and finally (d) follows by the third rate bound in $R_{\rm A}$.

Concluding, we see that

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Alt}}(Q_{U',V',X|S}) = \min\Big\{I(V';Y|U') - I(V';Z|U'), I(U',V';Y) - I(U',V';S)\Big\} \geq R_{\mathrm{A}}, \tag{172}$$

which completes the proof.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

The inequality on the LHS of (29) is straightforward (allowing correlation between T and S cannot decrease the achievable rate). Thus, we only need to show that for any $P_{T,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X})$ there exists $Q_{U,V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$, such that

$$R_{\mathrm{CEG}}\left(P_{T,X|S}\right) \leq R_{\mathrm{Alt}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right). \tag{173}$$

Throughout the proof we use the notation I_P and I_Q to denote a mutual information term that is calculated with respect to $P_{T,X|S}$ or $Q_{U,V,X|S}$, respectively. Fix $P_{T,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X})$. If $I_P(T;Y,S) \leq I_P(T;Z)$, then

$$R_{\mathrm{CEG}}\left(P_{T,X|S}\right) = \min\Big\{I_P(T;Y|S), H_P(S|T,Z)\Big\}, \tag{174}$$

and we set $U = T$, $V = S$ and $Q_{X|T,S} = P_{X|T,S}$ into $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ to get:

$$I_Q(V;Y,S|U) - I_Q(V;Z|U) = I_P(S;Y,S|T) - I_P(S;Z|T) = H_P(S|T,Z), \tag{175a}$$

$$I_Q(U,V;Y,S) - I_Q(U,V;S) = I_P(S,T;Y,S) - I_P(S,T;S) = I_P(T;Y|S), \tag{175b}$$

If, on the other hand, $P_{T,X|S}$ is such that $I_P(T;Y,S) > I_P(T;Z)$, then

$$R_{\mathrm{CEG}}\left(P_{T,X|S}\right) = \min\Big\{I_P(T;Y|S), I_P(T;Y|S) - I_P(T;Z|S) + H_P(S|Z)\Big\}. \tag{176}$$

In this case we take $U = 0$, $V = (T,S)$ and $Q_{X|T,S} = P_{X|T,S}$. Substituting into $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{Enc-Dec-CSI}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} I_Q(V;Y,S|U) - I_Q(V;Z|U) &= I_P(S,T;Y,S) - I_P(S,T;Z) \\ &= I_P(T;Y|S) - I_P(T;Z|S) + H_P(S|Z), \end{aligned} \tag{177a}$$

$$I_Q(U,V;Y,S) - I_Q(U,V;S) = I_P(S,T;Y,S) - I_P(S,T;S) = I_P(T;Y|S), \tag{177b}$$

from which (173) follows.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF COROLLARY 1

A. Direct

We use Theorem 1 to establish the achievability of Corollary 1. For any $Q_{U,V,X|S} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X}$, replacing Y and Z in $R_{\mathrm{A}}\left(Q_{U,V,X|S}\right)$ with $(Y.S_1)$ and (Z, S_2), respectively, gives that

$$R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{RLN}}(Q_{U,V,X|S}) = \min\Big\{I(V;Y,S_1|U) - I(V;Z,S_2|U), I(U,V;Y,S_1) - I(U,V;S) \\ , I(U,V;Y,S_1) - I(U;S) - I(V;Z,S_2|U)\Big\} \quad (178)$$

is achievable.

To properly define the choice of $Q_{U,V,X|S}$ that achieves (32), recall the P distribution stated after (31) that factors as $W_S P_{A|S} P_{B|A} P_X W_{S_1,S_2|S} W_{Y,Z|X}$ and let $\tilde{P}$ be a PMF over $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{X}$, such that

$$\tilde{P}_{S,A,B,X,S_1,S_2,Y,Z,\tilde{B},\tilde{X}} = P_{S,A,B,X,S_1,S_2,Y,Z} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{B}=B\} \cap \{\tilde{X}=X\}}. \quad (179)$$

Now, fix $P_{S,A,B,X,S_1,S_2,Y,Z}$ and let $Q_{U,V,X|S}$ in (22) be such that $V = (A,B)_{\tilde{P}}$, $U = (\tilde{B},\tilde{X})_{\tilde{P}}$ and $Q_{X|S,U,V} = \tilde{P}_X = P_X$, where the subscript $\tilde{P}$ means that the random variables on the RHS are distributed according to their marginal from (179). Consequently, $Q_{U,V,X|S} W_{S_1,S_2|S} W_{Y,Z|X}$ equals to the RHS of (179). We next evaluate the mutual information term in R_{A} from (22) and show it coincides with 32. In doing so, we once again make use of the notation I_Q, $I_{\tilde{P}}$ and I_P to indicated that a mutual information term is taken with respect to the PMF Q, $\tilde{P}$ or P, respectively. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_Q(V;Y,S_1|U) - I_Q(V;Z,S_2|U) &= I_{\tilde{P}}(A,B;Y,S_1|\tilde{B},\tilde{X}) - I_{\tilde{P}}(A,B;Z,S_2|\tilde{B},\tilde{X}) \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} I_P(A;S_1|B,X) + I_P(A;Y|B,X,S_1) - I_P(A;S_2|B,X) \\ &\qquad - I_P(A;Z|B,X,S_2) \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} I_P(A;S_1|B) - I_P(A;S_2|B) \end{aligned} \quad (180)$$

where (a) is because $\tilde{B} = B$ and $\tilde{X} = X$ with probability 1 and since $\tilde{P}_{S,A,B,X,S_1,S_2,Y,Z} = P_{S,A,B,X,S_1,S_2,Y,Z}$. Step (b) is because in P the chain $(Y,Z) - X - (A,B,S_1,S_2)$ is Markov.

Next, consider

$$\begin{aligned} I_Q(U,V;Y,S_1) - I_Q(U,V;S) &= I_{\tilde{P}}(A,B,\tilde{B},\tilde{X};Y,S_1) - I_{\tilde{P}}(A,B,\tilde{B},\tilde{X};S) \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} I_P(A,B,X;Y,S_1) - I_P(A,B,X;S) \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} I_P(A,B,X;Y|S_1) - I_P(A,B;S|S_1) \\ &\overset{(c)}{=} I_P(X;Y) - I_P(A;S|S_1) \end{aligned} \quad (181)$$

where:

(a) is for the same reason as step (a) in the derivation of (180);

(b) is because in P we have the Markov chain $(A, B, X) - S - S_1$, since X is independent of (A, B, S, S_1) and due to the chain rule;

(c) follows because (X, Y) is independent of (A, B, S_1) and since $I(B; S|S_1, A) = 0$ as $B - A - (S, S_1)$ is also a Markov chain.

Finally, we shown that the third term from the RHS of (178) is redundant by establishing that $I_Q(V; S|U) \geq I_Q(V; Z, S_2|U)$, for the aforementioned choice of $Q_{U,V,X|S}$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} I_Q(V; Z, S_2|U) &\overset{(a)}{=} I_P(A; S_2|B) \\ &\leq I_P(A; S, S_2|B) \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} I_P(A, B; S) - I(B; S) \\ &\overset{(c)}{=} I_P(A; S|B, X) \\ &\overset{(d)}{=} I_Q(A; S|B, X) \end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

where:

(a) is due to similar arguments as those justifying (180);

(b) is because $(A, B) - S - S_2$ forms a Markov chain in P;

(c) is by the independence of (A, B, S) and X;

(d) follows from the definition of the $Q_{U,V,X|S}$ distribution.

Consequently, the third term in $R_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{RLN}}(Q_{U,V,X|S})$ is redundant due to (181), which along with (180) establishes the direct part of Corollary 1.

B. Converse

Let $\left\{c_n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of (n, R) semantically-secure codes for the SD-WTC with a vanishing maximal error probability. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large so that (21) is satisfied. Since both (21a) and (21b) hold for any message distribution $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, in particular, they hold for a uniform $P_M^{(U)}$. All the following multi-letter mutual information and entropy terms are calculated with respect to the induced joint PMF from (17), where the channel $W_{Y,Z|X,S}$ is replaced with $W_{S_1,S_2,Y,Z|X,S}$ defined in Section V-B2. Fano's inequality gives

$$H(M|S_1^n, Y^n) \leq 1 + n\epsilon R \triangleq n\epsilon_n, \tag{183}$$

where $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{n} + \epsilon R$.

The security criterion from (21b) and the reversely less noisy property of the channel $W_{Y,Z|X}$ (that, respectively, justify the two following inequalities) further gives

$$\epsilon \geq I(M; S_2^n, Z^n)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= I(M;S_2^n) + \sum_{\mathbf{s}_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2^n} W_{S_2}^n(\mathbf{s}_2) I(M;Z^n|S_2^n = \mathbf{s}_2) \\
&\geq I(M;S_2^n) + \sum_{\mathbf{s}_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2^n} W_{S_2}^n(\mathbf{s}_2) I(M;Y^n|S_2^n = \mathbf{s}_2) \\
&= I(M;S_2^n, Y^n). \qquad (184)
\end{aligned}
$$

Having (183) and (184), we bound R as

$$
\begin{aligned}
nR &= H(M) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(M;S_1^n, Y^n) - I(M;S_2^n, Y^n) + n\delta_n \\
&= I(M;S_1^n|Y^n) - I(M;S_2^n|Y^n) + n\delta_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[I(M;S_1^i, S_{2,i+1}^n|Y^n) - I(M;S_1^{i-1}, S_{2,i}^n|Y^n) \Big] + n\delta_n \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[I(M;S_{1,i}|S_1^{i-1}, S_{2,i+1}^n, Y^n) - I(M;S_{2,i}|S_1^{i-1}, S_{2,i+1}^n, Y^n) \Big] + n\delta_n \\
&\overset{(c)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[I(M;S_{1,i}|B_i) - I(M;S_{2,i}|B_i) \Big] + n\delta_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{=} n \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_T(i) \Big[I(M;S_{1,T}|B_T, T=i) - I(M;S_{2,T}|B_T, T=i) \Big] + n\delta_n \\
&= n \Big[I(M;S_{1,T}|B_T, T) - I(M;S_{2,T}|B_T, T) \Big] + n\delta_n \\
&\overset{(e)}{=} n \Big[I(A;S_1|B) - I(A;S_2|B) \Big] + n\delta_n \qquad (185)
\end{aligned}
$$

where:

(a) is by (183) and (184) while setting $\delta_n \triangleq \epsilon_n + \frac{\epsilon}{n}$;

(b) is a telescoping identity [25, Eqs. (9) and (11)];

(c) defined $B_i \triangleq (S_1^{i-1}, S_{2,i+1}^n, Y^n)$, for all $i \in [1:n]$. (d) is by introducing a time-sharing random variable T that is uniformly distributed over the set $[1:n]$ and is independent of all the other random variables in $P^{(c_n)}$;

(e) defines $S \triangleq S_T$, $S_1 \triangleq S_{1,T}$, $S_2 \triangleq S_{2,T}$, $X \triangleq X_T$, $Y \triangleq Y_T$, $Z \triangleq Z_T$, $B \triangleq (B_T, T)$ and $A \triangleq (M, B)$.

Another way to bound R is

$$
\begin{aligned}
nR &= H(M) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(M;S_1^n, Y^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= I(M;S_1^n, Y^n, S^n) - I(M;S^n|S_1^n, Y^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} I(M;Y^n|S_1^n, S^n) - I(M, Y^n;S^n|S_1^n) + I(S^n;Y^n|S_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= I(M, S^n;Y^n|S_1^n) - I(M, Y^n;S^n|S_1^n) + n\epsilon_n
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} I(M,S^n;Y^n) - I(M,Y^n;S^n|S_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(d)}{\leq} I(X^n;Y^n) - I(M,Y^n;S^n|S_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(e)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[I(X_i;Y_i) - I(M,Y^n;S_i|S_1^n,S^{i-1}) \Big] + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(f)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[I(X_i;Y_i) - I(M,Y^n,S_1^{n\setminus i},S^{i-1};S_i|S_{1,i}) \Big] + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(g)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[I(X_i;Y_i) - I(M,B_i;S_i|S_{1,i}) \Big] + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(h)}{=} n \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_T(i) \Big[I(X_T;Y_T|T=i) - I(M,B_T;S_T|S_{1,T},T=i) \Big] + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(i)}{\leq} n \Big[I(X_T;Y_T) - I(M,B_T,T;S_T|S_{1,T}) \Big] + n\epsilon_n \\
&\overset{(j)}{\leq} n \Big[I(X;Y) - I(A;S|S_1) \Big] + n\epsilon_n
\end{aligned} \tag{186}
$$

where:

(a) is by (183);

(b) uses the independence of M and (S_1^n, S^n) (1st term);

(c) is because conditioning cannot increase entropy and since $Y^n - (M,S^n) - S_1^n$ forms a Markov chain (1st term);

(d) uses the Markov relation $Y^n - X^n - (M,S^n)$;

(e) follows since conditioning cannot increase entropy and by the discrete and memoryless property of the WTC $W_{Y,Z|X}^n$;

(f) is because $P_{S^n,S_1^n,S_2^n}^{(c_n)} = W_{S,S_1,S_2}^n$, i.e., the marginal distribution of (S^n, S_1^n, S_2^n) are i.i.d.;

(g) is by the definition of B_i;

(h) follows for the same reason as step (d) in the derivation of (185);

(i) is because conditioning cannot increase entropy and the Markov relation $Y_T - X_T - T$ (1st term), and because $\mathbb{P}\big(S_T = s, S_{1,T} = s_1, T = t\big) = W_{S,S_1}(s,s_1)P_T(t)$, for all $(s,s_1,t) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}_1 \times [1:n]$ (2nd term);

(j) reuses the definition of the single-letter random variable from step (e) in the derivation of (185).

The joint distribution of the defined random variables factors as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\big(S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2,A=a,B=b,X=x,Y=y,Z=z\big) \\
&\qquad = W_S(s)W_{S_1,S_2|S}(s_1,s_2|s)\mathbb{P}\big(A=a\big|S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2\big)\mathbb{P}\big(B=b\big|A=a\big) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{P}\big(X=x\big|S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2,A=a,B=b\big)W_{Y,Z|X}(y,z|x),
\end{aligned} \tag{187}
$$

where the equalities $\mathbb{P}\big(S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2\big) = W_S(s)W_{S_1,S_2|S}(s_1,s_2|s)$ and $\mathbb{P}\big(Y=y,Z=z\big|S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2,A=a,B=b,X=x\big) = W_{Y,Z|X}(y,z|x)$ are straightforward from the probabilistic relations in $P^{(c_n)}$ and the definition of the random variable T, while $\mathbb{P}\big(B=b\big|S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2,A=a\big) = \mathbb{P}\big(B=b\big|A=a\big)$

follows because $A=(M,B)$. Furthermore, for every $(s,s_1,s_2,a)\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{S}_1\times\mathcal{S}_2\times\mathcal{A}$, it holds that $\mathbb{P}\big(A=a\big|S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2\big)=\mathbb{P}\big(A=a\big|S=s\big)$. To see this, for any $(s^n,s_1^n,s_2^n,y^n)\in\mathcal{S}^n\times\mathcal{S}_1^n\times\mathcal{S}_2^n\times\mathcal{Y}^n$, we define the corresponding realization of A as $a=(t,m,b_t)$, where $(t,m)\in[1:n]\in\mathcal{M}_n$ and $b_t=\big(y^n,s_1^{t-1},s_{2,t+1}^n\big)$. Let $(s_t,s_{1,t},s_{2,t})\in\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{S}_1\times\mathcal{S}_2$ (the and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\big(A=a\big|S=s_t,S_1=s_{1,t},S_2=s_{2,t}\big)\\
&\quad\overset{(a)}{=}P_T(t)P^{(c_n)}\left(m,s_1^{t-1},s_{2,t+1}^n,y^n|s_t,s_{1,t},s_{2,t}\right)\\
&\quad=P_T(t)\sum_{(s^{n\setminus t},x^n)\in\mathcal{S}^{n-1}\times\mathcal{X}^n}P^{(c_n)}\left(s^{n\setminus t},x^n,m,s_1^{t-1},s_{2,t+1}^n,y^n\Big|s_t,s_1^t,s_{2,t}^n,m\right)\\
&\quad\overset{(b)}{=}P_T(t)P_M(m)\sum_{(s^{n\setminus t},x^n)\in\mathcal{S}^{n-1}\times\mathcal{X}^n}W_S^{n-1}\left(s^{n\setminus t}\right)W_{S_1|S}^{t-1}\left(s_1^{t-1}|s^{t-1}\right)W_{S_2|S}^{n-t}\left(s_{2,t+1}^n|s_{t+1}^n\right)\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\times f_n\left(x^n\big|m,s^n\right)W_{Y|X}^n\left(y^n|x^n\right)\\
&\quad=P_T(t)P^{(c_n)}\left(m,s_1^{t-1},s_{2,t+1}^n,y^n|s_t\right)\\
&\quad=\mathbb{P}\big(A=a\big|S=s_t\big)
\end{aligned}\tag{188}$$

where (a) is because T is independent of all the other random variables, while (b) uses the dependence relations in $P^{(c_n)}$ from (17) with $W_{S_1,S_2|S}W_{Y,Z|X}$ in the role of the SDWTC.

Denoting $\mathbb{P}\big(A=a\big|S=s\big)\triangleq P_{A|S}(a|s)$, $\mathbb{P}\big(B=b\big|A=a\big)\triangleq P_{B|A}(b|a)$ and $\mathbb{P}\big(X=x\big|S=s,S_1=s_1,S_2=s_2,A=a,B=b\big)\triangleq P_{X|S,S_1,S_2,A,B}(x|s,s_1,s_2,a,b)$, we have the following bound on the achievable rate

$$R\leq\frac{\min\Big\{I(A;S_1|B)-I(A;S_2|B),I(X;Y)-I(A;S|S_1)\Big\}}{1-\epsilon}+\frac{1}{(1-\epsilon)n}+\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon},\tag{189}$$

where the mutual information terms are calculated with respect to the joint PMF $W_SW_{S_1,S_2|S}P_{A|S}P_{B|A}P_{X|S,S_1,S_2,A,B}W_{Y,Z|X}$. However, noting that in none of the mutual information terms from (189) do X and (S,S_1,S_2,A,B) appear together, we may replace $P_{X|S,S_1,S_2,A,B}$ with P_X without affecting the expressions. Taking $\epsilon\to0$ and $n\to\infty$ completes the proof of the converse.

APPENDIX D
CONVERSE PROOF FOR COROLLARY 2

Let $\big\{c_n\big\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of (n,R) for the SD-WTC satisfying (21). By similar arguments to those presented in the converse proof from Appendix C-B, we assume a uniform message distribution and note that all the following multi-letter mutual information and entropy terms are take with respect to (17). By Fano's inequality, we have

$$H(M|Y^n)\leq1+n\epsilon R\triangleq n\epsilon_n,\tag{190}$$

where $\epsilon_n=\frac{1}{n}+\epsilon R$.

First, we bound the rate R as

$$\begin{aligned} nR &= H(M) \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(M;Y^n) - I(M;Z^n) + n\epsilon'_n \\ &\leq I(M;Y^n|Z^n) + n\epsilon'_n \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H(Y_i|Z_i) + n\epsilon'_n \end{aligned} \tag{191}$$

where (a) uses (21b) and (190) and defines $\epsilon'_n \triangleq \epsilon_n + \frac{\epsilon}{n}$, and (b) follows by the chain rule and since conditioning cannot increase entropy.

Another way to bound R is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} nR &= H(M) \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} I(M;Y^n) - I(M;S^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\leq I(M;Y^n|S^n) + n\epsilon'_n \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{n} H(Y_i|S_i) + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned} \tag{192}$$

where (a) is due to (190) and because M and S^n are independent in (17), while (b) is justified similarly to step (b) in (191). Having (191)-(192), the converse is established by standard time-sharing argument (as in the proof of Corollary 1 from Appendix C).

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF LEMMA 2

Property (1) essentially follows because X and Y are connected by a BSC(α), with $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. The independence of Y and S means that

$$P_{Y|S}(0|s) = P_{Y|S}(0|s'), \quad \forall (s, s') \in \mathcal{S}^2, \tag{193}$$

and assume by contradiction that a similar relation does not hold for S and X. Namely, assume that there exists a pair $(s, s') \in \mathcal{S}^2$, such that

$$P_{X|S}(0|s) \neq P_{X|S}(0|s'). \tag{194}$$

Denote $P_{X|S}(0|s) = \gamma$ and $P_{X|S}(0|s') = \gamma'$, where $\gamma, \gamma' \in [0,1]$ and $\gamma \neq \gamma'$. Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Y|S}(0|s) &\overset{(a)}{=} P_{X|S}(0|s)W_{Y|X}(0|0) + P_{X|S}(1|s)W_{Y|X}(0|1) \\ &= \gamma(1-\alpha) + (1-\gamma)\alpha \\ &\triangleq \gamma * \alpha \end{aligned} \tag{195}$$

where (a) is because $S - X - Y$ forms a Markov chain. By repeating similar steps for $P_{Y|S}(0|s')$, we get

$$P_{Y|S}(0|s') = \gamma'(1-\alpha) + (1-\gamma')\alpha. \tag{196}$$

Combining (195)-(196) with (193) gives that $\gamma = \gamma'$, which is a contradiction. Therefore S and X must be independent.

For the second property in Lemma 2, recall that from the equality in step (e) of (49), we have that $X-(V,S)-Y$, i.e.,

$$P_{X,Y|V,S}(x,y|v,s) = P_{X|V,S}(x|v,s)P_{Y|V,S}(y|v,s), \quad \forall (v,s,x,y) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}. \tag{197}$$

However, the Markov chain $(V,S) - X - Y$ also holds, which means that $P_{X,Y|V,S}$ factors as

$$P_{X,Y|V,S}(x,y|v,s) = P_{X|V,S}(x|v,s)W_{Y|X}(y|x), \quad \forall (v,s,x,y) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}. \tag{198}$$

Therefore, for every $(v,s,x,y) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$ either $P_{X|V,S}(x|v,s) = 0$ or $P_{Y|V,S}(y|v,s) = W_{Y|X}(y|x)$. In particular, for $(x,y) = (1,1)$ and any $(v,s) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S}$, either

$$P_{X|V,S}(1|v,s) = 0 \tag{199a}$$

or

$$P_{Y|V,S}(1|v,s) = W_{Y|X}(1|1) = \bar{\alpha}. \tag{199b}$$

If (199b) holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Y|V,S}(1|v,s) &\overset{(a)}{=} P_{X|V,S}(0|v,s)W_{Y|X}(1|0) + P_{X|V,S}(1|v,s)W_{Y|X}(1|1) \\ &= \alpha P_{X|V,S}(0|v,s) + \bar{\alpha}P_{X|V,S}(1|v,s) \\ &= \alpha + (1-2\alpha)P_{X|V,S}(1|v,s) \end{aligned} \tag{200}$$

where (a) uses the Markov chain $(V,S) - X - Y$. When combined with (199b), this gives

$$P_{X|V,S}(1|v,s) = 1. \tag{201}$$

Thus, for any $(v,s) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S}$ either (199a) or (201) is true, which implies that there exists $f : \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{X}$ such that $X = f(V,S)$.

APPENDIX F
PROOF OF LEMMA 3

The derivation of Property (1) from Lemma 3 follows the exact same line presented in the proof of Property (2) from Lemma 2 (see Appendix E), while replacing (V,S) in the latter proof with V only. The proof is, therefore, omitted.

Proving Properties (2) and (3) of the lemma is also reminiscent of the proof of Lemma 2. However, here slight modifications of the arguments are needed. For completeness, the details are as follows.

To see that the independence of S_1 and Y implies that S and Y are also independent (Property (2)), note that the former independence implies

$$P_{S_1|Y}(1|y) = P_{S_1|Y}(1|y'). \quad \forall (y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2, \tag{202}$$

Assume by contradiction that there exists a pair $(y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2$, such that

$$P_{S|Y}(1|y) \neq P_{S|Y}(1|y'). \tag{203}$$

Denote $P_{S|Y}(1|y) = \delta$ and $P_{S|Y}(1|y') = \delta'$, where $\delta, \delta' \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta \neq \delta'$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{S_1|Y}(1|y) &\overset{(a)}{=} P_{S|Y}(0|y)W_{S_1|S}(1|0) + P_{S|Y}(1|y)W_{S_1|S}(1|1) \\ &\overset{(b)}{=} \delta(1-\sigma) \end{aligned} \tag{204}$$

where (a) is because $Y - S - S_1$ forms a Markov chain, while (b) is since $W_{S_1|S}$ is a BEC(σ), which in particular means that $W_{S_1|S}(1|0) = 0$. Similar steps also give

$$P_{S_1|Y}(1|y') = \delta'(1-\sigma). \tag{205}$$

Combining (204)-(205) with (202) gives that $\delta = \delta'$, which is a contradiction. Therefore S and Y are independent, which establishes Property (2) of the lemma.

For Property (3), recall that from the equality in step (d) of (51), we have that $S - (V, Y) - S_1$, i.e.,

$$P_{S,S_1|V,Y}(s, s_1|v, y) = P_{S|V,Y}(s|v, y)P_{S_1|V,Y}(s_1|v, y), \quad \forall (v, y, s, s_1) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}_1. \tag{206}$$

Now, since the Markov chain $(V, Y) - S - S_1$ also holds, another factorization of $P_{S,S_1|V,Y}$ is

$$P_{S,S_1|V,Y}(s, s_1|v, y) = P_{S|V,Y}(s|v, y)W_{S_1|S}(s_1|s), \quad \forall (v, y, s, s_1) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}_1. \tag{207}$$

As before, (206)-(207) imply that for every $(v, y, s, s_1) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}_1$ either $P_{S|V,Y}(s|v, y) = 0$ or $P_{S_1|V,Y}(s_1|v, y) = W_{S_1|S}(s_1|s)$. Taking $(s, s_1) = (1, 1)$, we see that for any $(v, y) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y}$, either

$$P_{S|V,Y}(1|v, y) = 0 \tag{208a}$$

or

$$P_{S_1|V,Y}(1|v, y) = W_{S_1|S}(1|1) = \bar{\sigma}. \tag{208b}$$

If (199b) holds, we have

$$P_{S_1|V,Y}(1|v, y) \overset{(a)}{=} P_{S|V,Y}(0|v, y)W_{S_1|S}(1|0) + P_{S|V,Y}(1|v, y)W_{S_1|S}(1|1)$$

$$\overset{(b)}{=} \bar{\sigma} P_{S|V,Y}(1|v,y) \tag{209}$$

where (a) uses the Markov chain $(V,Y)-S-S_1$ and (b) is because $W_{S_1|S}$ is a BEC(σ). Along with (208b), (209) implies that

$$P_{S|V,Y}(1|v,y) = 1. \tag{210}$$

Concluding, for any $(v,y) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{Y}$ either (208a) or (210) is true. This means that there exists $g_2 : \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{S}$ such that $S = g_2(V,Y)$.

APPENDIX G
PROOF OF LEMMA 5

The proof uses several basic properties of Rényi divergence (see, e.g., [26]). First, recall that for fixed measures μ and ν, $d_\alpha(\mu,\nu)$ is monotone non-decreasing in α. Furthermore, if $\mu \ll \nu$ then $d_\alpha(\mu,\nu)$ is contineous in $\alpha \in (1,\infty]$. Since a joint PMF is always absolutely contineous with respect to the product of its marginals and by the choices of δ_1 and δ_2, there exists $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$ such that

$$R_1 - \delta_1 > d_{\alpha_1}(Q_{U,W}, Q_U, Q_W) \geq d_1(Q_{U,W}, Q_U, Q_W) = I(U;W), \tag{211a}$$

$$R_1 + R_2 - \delta_2 > d_{\alpha_2}(Q_{U,V,W}, Q_{U,V}, Q_W) \geq d_1(Q_{U,V,W}, Q_{U,V}, Q_W) = I(U,V;W). \tag{211b}$$

On account of (211), by setting $\alpha = \min\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2\}$, we conclude that $\beta^{(j)}_{\alpha,\delta_j} > 0$, for $j = 1,2$.

APPENDIX H
PROOF OF LEMMA 7

First note that for any $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$, $\mathcal{B}_n$ and $(i,j,m,\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{M}_n\times\mathcal{S}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,j|m,\mathbf{s}) &= \frac{\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(m,i,j,\mathbf{s})}{\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(m,\mathbf{s})} \\
&= \frac{\sum\limits_{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})\in\mathcal{U}^n\times\mathcal{V}^n} P_M(m)2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}\right\}\cap\left\{\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V)=\mathbf{v}\right\}} Q^n_{S|U,V}(\mathbf{s}|\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v})}{\sum\limits_{(i',j',\mathbf{u}',\mathbf{v}')\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n\times\mathcal{U}^n\times\mathcal{V}^n} P_M(m)2^{-n(R_1+R_2)}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\mathbf{u}(i',\mathcal{B}_U)=\mathbf{u}'\right\}\cap\left\{\mathbf{v}(i',j',m,\mathcal{B}_V)=\mathbf{v}'\right\}} Q^n_{S|U,V}(\mathbf{s}|\mathbf{u}',\mathbf{v}')} \\
&= \frac{Q^n_{S|U,V}\big(\mathbf{s}\big|\mathbf{u}(i,\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i,j,m,\mathcal{B}_V)\big)}{\sum_{(i',j')\in\mathcal{I}_n\times\mathcal{J}_n} Q^n_{S|U,V}\big(\mathbf{s}\big|\mathbf{u}(i',\mathcal{B}_U),\mathbf{v}(i',j',m,\mathcal{B}_V)\big)} \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}(i,j|m,\mathbf{s})
\end{aligned} \tag{212}$$

where (a) is by the definition from (102). Having (212), note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\Big|P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{M,\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \\
&\qquad\qquad \overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n} P_M(m)\Big|\Big|P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}|M=m} - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S},I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}|M=m}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n} P_M(m)\Big|\Big|W_S^n - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S}|M=m}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}$$
$$\leq \max_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n} \Big|\Big|W_S^n - \Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S}|M=m}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \tag{213}$$

where (a) is because $\Gamma_M^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} = P_M^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} = P_M$, while (b) is based on the property of total variation that for any $P_X, Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $P_{Y|X} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ we have $\big|\big|P_X P_{Y|X} - Q_X P_{Y|X}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \big|\big|P_X - Q_X\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}$. Combining this with (212) and the equalities

$$\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V}|I,J,\mathbf{S},M=m} = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{U}=\mathbf{U}(I,\mathcal{B}_U)\}\cap\{\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{V}(I,J,m,\mathcal{B}_V)\}} = P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V}|I,J,\mathbf{S},M=m} \tag{214a}$$
$$\Gamma^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},I,J,\mathbf{S},M=m} = Q^n_{X|U,V,S} W^n_{Y,Z|X,S} = P^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},I,J,\mathbf{S},M=m}. \tag{214b}$$

justifies (b).

Now, for any $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$ and sufficiently large n consider

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big|\Big|P^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S},M,I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}} - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S},M,I,J,\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V},\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{Z}}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\tilde{\alpha}}\Big) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n}\Big|\Big|W_S^n - \Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S}|M=m}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} > e^{-n\tilde{\alpha}}\Big)\\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}\Big(\max_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n} D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S}|M=m}\Big|\Big|W_S^n\Big) > 2e^{-2n\tilde{\alpha}}\Big)\\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}_n}\mathbb{P}\Big(D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S}|M=m}\Big|\Big|W_S^n\Big) > e^{-2n\tilde{\alpha}}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{215}$$

where (a) is due to (213), while (b) follows by Pinsker's Inequality that states that for any two measures μ, ν on a measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$, it holds that

$$\big|\big|\mu - \nu\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} D\big(\mu\big|\big|\nu\big)}. \tag{216}$$

Consequently, if the total variation does not converge then the same is true for the corresponding relative entropy. Finally, (c) uses the union bound.

To conclude the proof note that each of the summands on the RHS of (215) falls within the framework of the strong SCL for superposition codes (Lemma 1), with respect to the DMC $Q^n_{S|U,V}$. Therefore, taking (R_1, R_2) as in (107) implies that there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$ and an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $n > n_0$

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(D\Big(\Gamma^{(\mathbb{B}_n)}_{\mathbf{S}|M=m}\Big|\Big|W_S^n\Big) > e^{-n\gamma_1}\Big) \leq e^{-e^{n\gamma_2}}. \tag{217}$$

The stronger result from Lemma 7 (i.e., (108)) then follows from (215) and (217) for $\alpha_1 = \frac{\gamma_1}{2}$ and $\alpha_2 = \gamma_2$. To get (109), we use [14, Lemma 2], where it is stated that the stronger version of the SCL indeed implies Wyner's original notion of soft-covering where the convergence is of the expected value.

APPENDIX I
PROOF OF LEMMA 8

Fix $P_M \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}_n)$ and consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|I_P(M;\mathbf{Z}) - I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z})\Big| &= \Big|H_P(M) + H_P(\mathbf{Z}) - H_P(M,\mathbf{Z}) - H_\Gamma(M) - H_\Gamma(\mathbf{Z}) + H_\Gamma(M,\mathbf{Z})\Big| \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} \Big|H_P(\mathbf{Z}) - H_\Gamma(\mathbf{Z})\Big| + \Big|H_\Gamma(M,\mathbf{Z}) - H_P(M,\mathbf{Z})\Big| \\
&\overset{(b)}{\leq} \Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \log \frac{|\mathcal{Z}^n|}{\Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}} \\
&\qquad + \Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \log \frac{|\mathcal{M}_n|\cdot|\mathcal{Z}^n|}{\Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}}} \\
&\overset{(c)}{\leq} e^{-n\delta_1}\Big(n\log|\mathcal{Z}| + n\log\big(2^R|\mathcal{Z}|\big)\Big) - \Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \log\Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \\
&\qquad - \Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \log\Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \qquad (218)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is because $H_P(M) = H_\Gamma(M)$ and due to the triangle inequality, (b) uses [27, Theorem 17.3.3], while (c) follows by the assumption in (123).

Note that the function $x \mapsto -x\log x$ is monotone increasing for $x \in \Big[0, 2^{-\frac{1}{\ln 2}}\Big]$ and that there exists an $\tilde{n}_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $e^{-n\delta_1} \in \Big[0, 2^{-\frac{1}{\ln 2}}\Big]$, for all $n > \tilde{n}_1$. Finally, since $\Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq e^{-n\delta_1}$, we have that for all $n > \tilde{n}_1$

$$-\Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \log\Big|\Big|P_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} - \Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \log\Big|\Big|P_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)} - \Gamma_{M,\mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B}_n)}\Big|\Big|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq -2e^{-n\delta_1}\log e^{-n\delta_1}. \qquad (219)$$

Plugging (219) into (218) gives

$$\Big|I_P(M;\mathbf{Z}) - I_\Gamma(M;\mathbf{Z})\Big| \leq ne^{-n\delta_1}\left(2\log|\mathcal{Z}| + R + 2\delta_1\frac{1}{\ln 2}\right). \qquad (220)$$

Letting $\tilde{n}_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\delta_2 \triangleq \delta_1 - \frac{\ln\tilde{n}_2 + \ln\left(2\log|\mathcal{Z}| + R + 2\delta_1\frac{1}{\ln 2}\right)}{\tilde{n}_2} > 0$, the result of Lemma 8 follows by setting $n_1 = \max\{n_0, \tilde{n}_1, \tilde{n}_2\}$.

APPENDIX J
PROOF OF LEMMA 9

Throughout this proof we denote the entropy of a random variable $X \sim P_X$, where $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, by $H(P_X)$ instead of $H_P(X)$ that was used before. Consider the following:

$$\Big|D\big(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}\big|\big|Q_{Y|X}^n\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}\big)\Big| \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\left|\sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})} P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\log\frac{P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}{Q_{Y|X}^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})}\right|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\Big|H\big(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}\big) - H\big(Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})} P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})} Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\Big| \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\Bigg[\Big|H\big(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}\big) - H\big(Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big)\Big| \\
&\qquad\qquad + \Big|\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}}\log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{Q^n_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}}\log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{x})\Big|\Bigg] \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\Bigg[\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} - Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}\log\frac{|\mathcal{Y}|^n}{\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} - Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}} \\
&\qquad\qquad + b(\mathbf{x})\cdot\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} - Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}\Bigg]
\end{aligned}
\tag{221}
$$

where (a) uses [27, Theorem 17.3.3] and [11, Property (b)]) that was mention in the Average Error Probability Analysis in Section VI-B, where the bound on the functions range is $b(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})}\Big|\log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})\Big|$.

For any $\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})$, we bound $b(\mathbf{x})$ from above as follows. First note that $\log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$, for every $\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})$. Then, recall that $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} \ll Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}$, for all $\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})$, and therefore, $\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}})$. Thus, for every $\mathbf{y}\in\mathrm{supp}\,\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}})$ we have that $y_i\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_{Y|X=x_i})$, for all $i\in[1:n]$, and so

$$
b(\mathbf{x}) \geq \log Q^n_{Y|X}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \geq \log\left(\prod_{i=1}^n \min_{y\in\mathrm{supp}(Q_{Y|X=x_i})} Q_{Y|X}(y|x_i)\right) \geq n\log\left(\min_{\substack{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}:\\ Q_{Y|X}(y|x)>0}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x)\right) > -\infty. \tag{222}
$$

Denoting $\mu_{Y|X} \triangleq \min_{\substack{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}:\\ Q_{Y|X}(y|x)>0}} Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$ we have that

$$
b(\mathbf{x}) \leq n\log\mu_{Y|X}, \tag{223}
$$

uniformly in $\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})$. Substituting (223) into the RHS of (221), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big|D\big(P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}\big|\big|Q^n_{Y|X}\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}\big)\Big| &\leq \big|\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}} - P_{\mathbf{X}}Q^n_{Y|X}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}\Big(n\log|\mathcal{Y}| + n\log\mu_{Y|X}\Big) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} - Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}\log\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} - Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{224}
$$

We further upper bound the last term in (221) using Jensen's inequality. For each $\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})$, denote $t(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}} - Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}$ and let $\mathcal{T} \triangleq \big\{t(\mathbf{x})\big\}_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})}$. The PMF $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ induces a PMF $P_T\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ defined by

$$
P_T(t) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}}):\\ t(\mathbf{x})=t}} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}). \tag{225}
$$

With respect to the above, we have

$$-\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}-Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}\log\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}-Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}} = -\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} P_T(t)\cdot t\log t \\ \overset{(a)}{\leq} -\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} tP_T(t)\right)\log\left(\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} tP_T(t)\right), \tag{226}$$

where (a) follows by Jensen's inequality applied on the concave function $t\mapsto -t\log t$. Finally, the proof is concluded by noting that

$$\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} tP_T(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathrm{supp}(P_{\mathbf{X}})} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})\big|\big|P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}-Q^n_{Y|X=\mathbf{x}}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \big|\big|P_{\mathbf{X}}P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}-P_{\mathbf{X}}Q^n_{Y|X}\big|\big|_{\mathrm{TV}}, \tag{227}$$

and inserting (226) into (224).

REFERENCES

[1] S. I. Gelfand and M. S. Pinsker. Coding for channel with random parameters. *Problemy Pered. Inform. (Problems of Inf. Trans.)*, 9(1):19–31, 1980.

[2] A. V. Kuznetsov and B. S. Tsybakov. Coding in a memory with defective cells. *Problemy Pered. Inform. (Problems of Inf. Trans.)*, 10(2):52–60, 1974.

[3] K. Marton. A coding theorem for the discrete memoryless broadcast channel. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 25(3):306–311, May 1979.

[4] A. D. Wyner. The wire-tap channel. *Bell Sys. Techn.*, 54(8):1355–1387, Oct. 1975.

[5] I. Csiszár and J. Körner. Broadcast channels with confidential messages. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 24(3):339–348, May 1978.

[6] Y. Chen and A. J. Han Vinck. Wiretap channel with side information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 54(1):395–402, Jan. 2008.

[7] W. Liu and B. Chen. Wiretap channel with two-sided state information. In *Proc. 41st Asilomar Conf. Signals, Syst. Comp*, page 893897, Pacific Grove, CA, US, Nov. 2007.

[8] Y.-K. Chia and A. El Gamal. Wiretap channel with causal state information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 58(5):2838–2849, May 2012.

[9] A. Khisti, S. N. Diggavi, and G. W. Wornell. Secret-key agreement with channel state information at the transmitter. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, 6(3):672–681, Mar. 2011.

[10] B. Dai, A. J. Han Vinck, Y. Luo, and X. Tang. Secret-key agreement with channel state information at the transmitter. *Entropy*, 15:445473, 2013.

[11] E. Song, P. Cuff, and V. Poor. The likelihood encoder for lossy compression. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 62(4):1836–1849, Apr. 2016.

[12] J. Villard and P. Piantanida. Secure lossy source coding with side information at the decoders. In *Proc. 48th Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control and Comput.*, Monticell, Illinois, United States, Sep. 2010.

[13] M. Bellare, S. Tessaro, and A. Vardy. A cryptographic treatment of the wiretap channe. In *Proc. Adv. Crypto. (CRYPTO 2012)*, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, Aug. 2012.

[14] Z. Goldfeld, P. Cuff, and H. H. Permuter. Semantic-security capacity for wiretap channels of type II. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 62(7):1–17, Jul. 2016.

[15] Z. Goldfeld, P. Cuff, and H. H. Permuter. Arbitrarily varying wiretap channels with type constrained states. *Submitted to IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 2016. Available on ArXiv at http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.03660.

[16] P. Cuff. Distributed channel synthesis. *IEEE. Trans. Inf. Theory*, 59(11):7071–7096, Nov. 2013.

[17] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, NY, USA, 1991.

[18] J. L. Massey. *Applied Digital Information Theory*. ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, 1980-1998.

[19] C. Mitrpant, A. J. Han Vinck, and Y. Luo. An achievable region for the Gaussian wiretap channel with side information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 52(5):2181–2190, May 2006.

[20] H. G. Eggleston. *Convexity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England York, 6th edition edition, 1958.

[21] H. Yamamoto. Rate-distortion theory for the Shannon cipher system. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 43(5):827835, May 1997.

[22] A. Khisti, S. N. Diggavi, and G. W. Wornell. Secret-key generation using correlated sources and channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 58(2):652–670, Feb. 2012.

[23] Z. Goldfeld, G. Kramer, H. H. Permuter, and P. Cuff. Strong secrecy for cooperative broadcast channels. *Submitted for publication to IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 2016. Available on ArXiv at http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.01286.

[24] A. Orlitsky and J. Roche. Coding for computing. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 47(3):903–917, Mar 2001.

[25] G. Kramer. Teaching IT: An identity for the Gelfand-Pinsker converse. *IEEE Inf. Theory Society Newsletter*, 61(4):4–6, Dec. 2011.

[26] T. van Erven and P. Harremoës. Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(7):3797–3820, Jul. 2014.

[27] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley, New-York, 2nd edition, 2006.